

# Modern Philology

VOLUME XV

January 1918

NUMBER 9

## NEW FACTS ABOUT GEORGE TURBERVILLE

### I

In the *Arte of English Poesie* (1589) Puttenham praises George Turberville thus:

In her Maiesties time that now is are sprong vp an other crew of Courtly makers Noble men and Gentlemen of her Maiesties owne seruauntes, who haue written excellently well . . . of which number is first that noble Gentleman *Edward Earle of Oxford*. *Thomas Lord of Bukhurst*, . . . *Henry Lord Paget*, *Sir Philip Sydney*, *Sir Walter Rawleigh*, *Master Edward Dyar*, *Maister Fulke Greuell*, *Gascon*, *Britton*, *Turberuille* and a great many other learned Gentlemen.<sup>1</sup>

In Book III, chap. xxii, Puttenham remarks:

The historiographer that should by such wordes report of these two kings [Henry VIII and Philip] gestes in that behalfe, should greatly blemish the honour of their doings and almost speake vntruly and iniuriously by way of abbasement, as another of our bad rymers that very indecently said.

*A misers mynde thou hast, thou hast a Princes pelfe.*

A lewd terme to be giuen to a Princes treasure (*pelfe*). . . . These and such other base wordes do greatly disgrace the thing and the speaker or writer.<sup>2</sup>

The phrase greatly provoked him, for in the following chapter he takes occasion to say: "Another of our vulgar makers, spake as illfaringly in this verse written to the dispraise of a rich man and couetous. Thou hast a misers minde (thou hast a princes pelfe) a

<sup>1</sup> Arber's reprint, p. 75 (Book I, chap. xxxi).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 266.

lewde terme to be spoken of a princes treasure, which in no respect nor for any cause is to be called pelfe, though it were neuer so meane."<sup>1</sup>

Koeppel was the first, I think, to point out that Puttenham had quoted Turberville's<sup>2</sup> lines, "Of a ritch Miser." They are:

A MISERS minde thou hast  
thou hast a princes pelfe;  
Which makes thee welthy to thine heire,  
a beggar to thy selfe.

Koeppel<sup>3</sup> naturally concluded that Puttenham had here nullified his former praise of Turberville, and Seccombe, in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, follows him by remarking that after Puttenham had praised Turberville he then called him a "bad rhymer." This would have been an extraordinary proceeding, and the truth is that Puttenham had probably never read the lines in Turberville's *Epitaphes*, but, by the phrases "another of our bad rymers" and "another of our vulgar makers," intended to condemn Timothy Kendall, a writer both bad and vulgar, who in his *Flowers of Epigrammes, out of sundrie the moste singular authours selected, as well auncient as late writers* (1577) prints these verses verbatim, without acknowledgment to Turberville, as being translated "out of Greek."

Kendall's plagiarisms are almost unbelievably impudent. Various writers have already pointed out the appearance of verses by Turberville in the *Flowers of Epigrammes* (Seccombe himself does so), but I doubt whether the extent of Kendall's plagiarisms has been realized. In the following list, which includes all the important borrowings, Kendall's epigram is first named, its equivalent in Turberville's *Epitaphes* is then given, and Kendall's method of treating the stolen verses is briefly indicated.<sup>4</sup>

#### EPIGRAMS SAID BY KENDALL TO BE TRANSLATED FROM AUSONIUS

1. Kendall's "To one that painted Echo" (p. 116) = Turberville's "To one that painted Echo" (p. 177). Almost verbatim.

<sup>1</sup> Arber's reprint, p. 281. Gregory Smith (*Elizabethan Critical Essays*, II, 421) referring to the lines quoted by Puttenham remarks: "This may be Heywood's: but I have failed to find it."

<sup>2</sup> In his *Epitaphes, Epigrams, etc.*, J. P. Collier's reprint, p. 214.

<sup>3</sup> "George Turberville's Verhältnis zur italienischen Litteratur," *Anglia*, N.F., XIII, 70-71.

<sup>4</sup> The page references are to the Spenser Society's reprint (1874) of the *Flowers of Epigrammes* and to Collier's reprint (1870 ?) of the *Epitaphes*.

2. "Of a Hare taken by a Dog-fishe" (p. 117) = "Of a Hare complayning of the hatred of Dogs" (p. 177). Verbatim.

3. "The same otherwise" (i.e., "Of Venus in armour," p. 120) = "Of Venus in Armour" (p. 176). Verbatim. By a typographical error Turberville's lines begin "In complete Pallas saw," instead of "In complete armour Pallas saw," and Kendall did not correct the error!

4. "Of the picture of Rufus a vaine Rhethoritian, of whom there is an Epigram before" (p. 120 [he refers to an epigram on p. 115, "Of the Picture of Rufus, a vaine Rhethorician," which he also gives under Ausonius, but which was no doubt suggested by Turberville]) = "Of the picture of a vaine Rhetorician" (p. 151). Verbatim. Kendall gives two further epigrams on Rufus immediately after this, each of which is dreadfully stupid; both, I feel sure, were suggested entirely by Turberville's epigram.

#### EPIGRAMS SAID BY KENDALL TO BE TRANSLATED "OUT OF GREEK"

5. "Of a Thracian lad" (p. 137) = "Of a Thracyan that was downde by playing on the Ise" (p. 195). Kendall has "that swam" and "bare" for Turberville's "it swam" and "bore"; otherwise he quotes verbatim.

6. "Fayned frendship" (p. 139) = "Of an open Foe and a fayned Friend" (p. 213). Kendall borrows the first four lines almost verbatim; Turberville's epigram has four other lines, for which Kendall substitutes eight, and these eight paraphrase, not only the four omitted lines, but also another epigram by Turberville on the same subject ("Againe") that immediately follows on p. 214.

7. "Against stepdames" (p. 140) = "Of the cruell hatred of Stepmothers" (p. 189). A close paraphrase; cf. No. 16, below.

8. "A controuersie betwene Fortune and Venus" (p. 140) = "A Controverisie of a conquest in Love twixt Fortune and Venus" (p. 110). Verbatim. Kendall has another epigram on this subject immediately preceding the foregoing (p. 140), suggested by, and a paraphrase of, Turberville's lines.

9. "To one, hauying a long nose" (p. 144) = "Of one that had a great Nose" (p. 149). Turberville's first two lines, "Stande with thy nose against/ the sunne with open chaps," Kendall renders as "Stand with thy snoute against the sunne,/ and open wide thy chaps"; he quotes the other two lines verbatim.

10. "Of a deaf Iudge, a deaf plaintife, and a deaf defendant" (p. 144) = "Of a deafe Plaintife, a deafe Defendant, and a deafe Judge" (p. 132). Turberville's first sixteen lines are borrowed almost verbatim; for his last twelve Kendall substituted two of his own, which make the epigram (so-called) pointless and the title senseless.

11. "Against one very deformed" (p. 145) = "Of a marvellous deformed man" (p. 152). A close paraphrase.

12. "Otherwise [of drunkennesse]" (p. 146) = "Of Dronkennesse" (p. 151). Verbatim.

13. "Againe of the same [dronkennesse]" (p. 147) = "Againe of Dronkennesse" (p. 151). Verbatim.

14. "Of a rich miser" (p. 147) = "Of a ritch Miser" (p. 214). Verbatim. This is the bad rhyme condemned (and quite justly) by Puttenham.

15. "Of Asclepiades, a greedie carle" (p. 148) = "Of a covetous Niggard, and a needie Mouse" (p. 128). Verbatim, but Kendall omits Turberville's last four lines.

EPIGRAM SAID BY KENDALL TO BE TRANSLATED FROM THEODORUS  
BEZA VEZELIUS

16. "Against stepdames" (p. 164) = "Againe [of the cruell hatred of Stepmothers]" (p. 189). Paraphrased; cf. No. 7, above.

Turberville was the greatest sufferer at the hands of this "vulgar maker," who also, however, plagiarized from Sir Thomas Elyot, Grimald, and the Earl of Surrey.<sup>1</sup>

## II

Turberville's works have never been given in correct order, though to do so requires little more than an attentive reading of his poems and prefaces. And this order must be established before any biographical sketch of the poet can hope to be accurate. Among the poems prefixed to his *Tragical Tales*, the extant edition of which is dated 1587, is one entitled "The Authour here declareth the cause why hee wrote these Histories, and forewent the translation of the learned Poet Lucan." In this we are told that Melpomene appeared to the poet, rebuked him for his attempt to translate Lucan, and advised him to follow her sister Clio only; for

Shee deales in case of liking loue,  
her lute is set but lowe:  
And thou wert wonte in such deuise,  
thine humour to bestow.  
1 As when thou toldest the Shepheards tale  
that Mantuan erst had pend:  
2 And turndst those letters into verse,  
that louing Dames did send  
Vnto their lingring mates, that fought  
at sacke and siege of Troy:

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *England's Parnassus*, ed. C. Crawford, Oxford, 1913, p. 485.



- 3 And as thou didst in writing of  
thy Songs of sugred ioy.  
4 Mancynus vertues fitter are,  
for thee to take in hande,  
Than glitering gleaues, and wreakfull warres,  
that all on slaughter stand.

According to this list, then, before the *Tragical Tales* appeared Turberville had already written four works, whose titles in extant copies run:

1. *The Eglogs of the Poet B. Mantuan Carmelitan*, Turned into English Verse, & set forth with the Argument to euery Egloge by George Turberville Gent. Anno. 1567. . . . Imprinted at London in Pater noster Rowe, at the signe of the Marmayde, by Henrie Bynneman.

2. *The Heroicall Epistles of the Learned Poet Publius Ouidius Naso*, In Englishe Verse: set out and translated by George Turberuile Gent. With Aulus Sabinus Aunsweres to certaine of the same. Anno Domini 1567. Imprinted at London, by Henry Denham.

3. *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets*, with a Discourse of the Friendly affections of Tymetes to Pyndara his Ladie. Newly corrected, with additions, and set out by George Turberuile, Gentleman. Anno Domini 1567. Imprinted at London, by Henry Denham.

4. *The Plaine Path to Perfect Vertue*: Deuised and found out by Mancinus a Latin Poet, and translated into English by G. Turberville Gentleman. . . . Imprinted at London in Knight-rider streate, by Henry Bynneman, for Leonard Maylard. Anno 1568. [Title from Hazlitt's *Handbook*, 1867, p. 368.]<sup>1</sup>

It by no means follows, however, that these works were written and published in this order.

Clearly enough, as Collier first pointed out, there was an earlier edition of the *Epitaphes* than that of 1567.<sup>2</sup> The title-page announces that the work is "newly corrected, with additions," and this is corroborated by the dedicatory epistle "To the Right Noble and his singular good Lady, Lady Anne, Countesse Warwick," in which Turberville wrote: "As at what time (Madame) I first published this fond and slender treatise of Sonets, I made bolde with you in dedication of so unworthy a booke to so worthie a Ladie," now I have increased "my former follie, in adding moe Sonets to those I wrote

<sup>1</sup> Leonard Maylarde registered "a boke intituled a playne path Waye to perfyete vertu &c" late in 1567 or early in 1568 (Arber's *Transcript*, I, 357).

<sup>2</sup> *Bibliographical Account of the Rarest Books*, II, 447. A fragment of what is supposed to be a copy of this first edition is said still to be extant.

before. . . . " It is impossible to tell what poems were in the original edition and what were later added; it is practically certain, however, that the *Epitaphes* was published after Barnaby Googe's *Epitaphes and Sonnets* appeared (March 15, 1563/64), for Googe's work deeply influenced Turbervile, who refers to it several times in his own *Epitaphes*.<sup>1</sup> Turbervile's epitaphs on Arthur Broke, who supposedly died in 1563, and on Sir John Tregonwell, who died in January, 1564/65, probably were written for the first edition of the *Epitaphes*, which, it seems safe to assume, was published in or after 1565.

The so-called first edition of the *Heroicall Epistles* was published, as a separate colophon at the end of the book states, on March 19, 1567,<sup>2</sup> that is, 1567/68; but in a dedicatory letter "To the Right Honorable and his Singular good Lord, Lord Tho. Hovvarde Vicount Byndon," Turbervile declares that these epistles "are the first fruites of his trauaile," while "To the Reader" he writes: "May be that if thou shewe thy selfe friendly in well accepting this prouision, thou shalt be inuited to a better banquet in time at my hands," evidently a reference to a projected edition of his *Epitaphes*. Evidence is at hand to prove the truth of Turbervile's statement that the *Epistles* preceded the *Epitaphes*. In the 1567 edition of the latter there is an address "To the Reader" which may have belonged to the original edition, and which says: "Here have I (gentle Reader) according to promise in my Translation [i.e., in the *Heroicall Epistles*], given thee a fewe Sonets"; and at the beginning of the work appear also lines addressed "To the rayling Route of Sycophants," in which after objecting to the criticisms that have been leveled at his work, Turbervile says:

For Ovid earst did I attempt the like,  
And for my selfe now shall I stick to strike?

<sup>1</sup> E.g., his verses called "Maister Googe his sonet of the paines of Loue" (p. 14), "Mayster Googe his Sonet" (p. 19), "Maister Googes fansie" (p. 205), "To Maister Googe his Sonet out of sight out of thought" (p. 222).

<sup>2</sup> Collier, *op. cit.*, II, 71; Hazlitt's *Handbook*, 1867, s.v. "Ovid." The copy (formerly owned by F. Locker-Lampson) in the Huntington Library, New York, also has this colophon. The colophon in the Harvard College Library copy does not have the words "Mar. 19": both the title-page and the colophon of this copy have been mended, and the address to the sycophants, signs. X 2-X 3, has been bound in after sign. A 8 b. But the Harvard copy seems to belong to the same edition as do those dated "Mar. 19, 1567."

Though thou [sycophant] affirme with rash and railing jawes  
 That I *invita* have Minerva made  
 My other booke, I gave thee no such cause  
 By any deede of mine to drawe thy blade.

This "other booke" was certainly the *Heroycall Epistles*, and it likewise has eleven six-line stanzas called "The Translator to the captious sort of Sycophants," which were probably not included in the first issue.

The Stationers' Registers, too, offer proof that the *Epistles* had appeared before 1567/68; for about July, 1566, Henry Denham (the publisher of the extant 1567/68 edition) licensed for publication "a boke intituled the fyrste epestle of Ovide,"<sup>1</sup> a day or two later licensed *An epestle of Ovide beyng the iiij<sup>th</sup> epestle &c.*,<sup>2</sup> and about January, 1566/67, paid twelve pence "for his lycense for ye pryntinge of the Reste of the Epestles of Ovide."<sup>3</sup> If Denham had printed the book immediately after securing this last license, it would have appeared several months before the 1567 edition of the *Epitaphes*, which was registered for publication about March, 1566/67;<sup>4</sup> and that he did actually print the *Epistles*, in part or in whole, at this time is certain; for otherwise Turberville's remark in the preface to the 1567 edition of the *Epitaphes*—"Here have I . . . according to promise in my Translation, given thee a few Sonets"—would be senseless. If his words are to be interpreted literally, the preface to the *Epistles* shows that this book, containing all his translations, preceded the first issue of the *Epitaphes*, and hence may have appeared by 1565; but it is possible that the address to Lord Howard was printed in the "boke intituled the fyrste epestle of Ovide," which Denham licensed, and may have published separately, in July, 1566, and that the first edition of the *Epitaphes* appeared shortly after this date, but before the *Epistles* were published in collected form.<sup>5</sup> The extant edition of the *Heroycall Epistles* dated March, 1567/68, at any rate cannot be the first edition.

<sup>1</sup> Arber's *Transcript*, I, 328.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 329.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 335.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 338.

<sup>5</sup> There would have been nothing unusual in so issuing one of Turberville's books twice in a year. They were all extremely popular. The *Epitaphes*, e.g., were printed in 1565?, 1567, 1570, 1579, 1584; the *Heroycall Epistles*, 1567/68, 1569, 1570?, 1600, 1605; the *Eplogs*, 1567, 1572, 1577, 1594, 1597.

Turbervile's *Eglogs*, too, may have been printed in two or more instalments, for Henry Bynneman (the publisher of the first extant edition) secured a "lycense for pryntinge of the fyrste iiij<sup>or</sup> eggloges of Mantuan &c" about January, 1566/67,<sup>1</sup> and about March of the same year a "lycense for pryntinge of a boke intituled the Rest of the eggleges of Mantuan."<sup>2</sup> It is more probable, however, that to protect his title from pirate printers, Bynneman licensed this work as the translation progressed and that immediately after he secured the last license the entire work was first published. In an address to the reader prefixed to the *Eglogs*, Turbervile remarks: "Having translated this Poet (gentle Reader) although basely and with barren pen, [I] thought it not good nor friendly to wythhold it from thee: knowing of olde thy wonted curtesie in perusing Bookes, and discretion in iudging them without affection," a remark which substantiates the statement that his first two works had appeared "of olde"—one or two years earlier.<sup>3</sup> Turbervile's *Plaine Path to Perfect Vertue*, translated from Mancinus, appeared in 1568; the book is not accessible to me, and I am unaware what light it may throw on these vexing bibliographical matters.

In 1567 Turbervile, then the most important professional poet in London, contributed complimentary verses to Geoffrey Fenton's *Certaine Tragicall Discourses written oute of Frenche and Latin*, a work which no doubt suggested the compilation of *Tragical Tales*, translated by Turbervile, *In time of his troubles, out of sundrie Italians*. The only extant copies of this work were "imprinted at London by Abell Ieffs, dwelling in the Forestreete without Crepelgate at the signe of the Bel. Anno Dom. 1587."<sup>4</sup> The nature of Turbervile's troubles will be discussed later; here it must be shown that the book appeared

<sup>1</sup> Arber's *Transcript*, I, 334.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 340.

<sup>3</sup> The *Eglogs*, dated 1567, seems actually to have come from the press shortly after the new year began (on March 25); so that it preceded by almost a year the March 19, 1567/68, edition of the *Heroycall Epistles*—another reason why that cannot be considered the first edition.

<sup>4</sup> The "tragical tales" are ten in number, seven being translated from Boccaccio, two from Bandello, and one from an unknown source. The book is considerably lengthened by a number of miscellaneous poems, for which a separate title-page is provided: "Epitaphes and Sonnettes annexed to the Tragical histories, By the Author. With some other broken pamphlettes and Epistles, sent to certaine his frends in England, at his being in Moscouis. Anno 1569. Omnia probate. Quod bonum est tenete."

The book was reprinted at Edinburgh, 1837 (fifty copies only)—a careful reprint, according to Collier's *Bibl. Account*, II, 452; "very incorrectly" reprinted, according to Hazlitt's *Handbook* (1867), p. 617—and my references are to this reprint.

between 1574 and 1575. It may be remarked, first of all, that from June, 1568, to September, 1569, Turberville was in Russia; most of the poems published in the *Tales* were, as will be shown, written after his return to England.

Prefixed to the *Tales* are verses (already referred to) in which the poet explains why he "forewent the translation of the learned Poet Lucan":

I had begonne that hard attempt,  
to turne that fertile soyle.  
My bullocks were alreadie yokte,  
and flatly fell to toyle.  
Me thought they laboured meetlie well,  
tyll on a certaine night

Melpomene appeared to him, advised him to continue to follow Clio, and rebuked his presumption thus:

How durst thou deale in field affaires?  
leaue off, vnyoke thy steeres.  
Let loftie Lucans verse alone.<sup>1</sup>

Now in Thomas Blener-Hasset's prefatory epistle, dated May 15, 1577, to the second part of the *Mirror for Magistrates* occurs this passage: "But how hard a thing it is to compell *Clio*, with her boysterous banners, to couch vnder the compasse of a few metered lines, I referre you vnto the good *Turberuile*, who so soone as he began to take the terrible treatise of *Lucan* in hand, he was inforst to vnyoke his steeres, and to make holy day."<sup>2</sup> From this Koeppel rightly decided that the *Tales* had appeared before May, 1577, and referred also to a note in Malone's copy of the *Tales* (1587 edition, now in the Bodleian), which runs: "There was a former edition of the *Tales* in 1576."<sup>3</sup> There may actually have been an edition of 1576<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This clumsy figure was probably suggested by an explanation in Googe's *Zodiacke of Life* (1560) of why he (Googe) gave up the translation of Lucan urged by Melpomene. See Arber's reprint, 1871, of Googe's *Eglogs*, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> *Mirror for Magistrates* (ed. J. Haslewood, 1815), I, 348. Haslewood noted that Blener-Hasset was quoting Turberville's own words.

<sup>3</sup> Koeppel, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-49. Seecombe, in the *D.N.B.*, apparently considers the 1587 edition the first and only edition.

<sup>4</sup> The existence of this 1576 edition has generally been assumed, e.g., by Wood-Bliss, *Athen. Ozon.*, I, 627; by Hutchins, *Dorset*, 1861, I, 196; by Chalmers, *Works of the English Poets*, I, 578; and by Lowndes, *Bibliographer's Manual*, 1834, II, 1839, following *Censura Literaria*, 2d ed., I, 318, where the existence of such an edition is merely taken for granted. Collier (*Bibl. Account*, II, 450) claimed to have a fragmentary copy of an edition apparently older than that of 1587, but strangely enough made no effort to establish its date.

(though Malone probably thought so because of Blener-Hasset's remark), but the book was certainly written and published before 1575.

The ten tragical tales were, the title-page informs us, "translated by Turberville, In time of his troubles," and his troubles were (as he thought!) over in 1575, for in the dedication of his *Booke of Faulconrie*,<sup>1</sup> published in that year, he addressed the Earl of Warwick as follows:

Had leysure answered my meaning, and sicknesse giuen but some reasonable time of truce sithence my late troubles, I had ere this in Englishe verse published, vnder the protection of your noble name the haughtie woorke of learned *Lucane*. . . . But occasions breaking off my purposes, & disease cutting my determinations therein, am now driuen to a newe matter . . . and forced to fall from haughtye warres, to hie fleeing Hawkes . . . yet for that it best fitteth a melancholike heade, surcharged with pensieue and sullen humors, my earnest sute must be for good acceptance at your honors hands.

This passage, with its reference to "my late troubles" and to the abandonment of the translation of Lucan, proves beyond all doubt that the *Booke of Faulconrie* appeared after the *Tragical Tales*. Had biographers actually read Turberville's work, this fact would long ago have been established.

The other limit of the appearance of the *Tales* can be fairly well established by an examination of the "Epitaphes and Sonnettes annexed to the Tragical histories." Three of the poems there printed are said to be poetical epistles written by Turberville from Russia in 1569. Among the others there are three that can be used in dating the book: one of these is an elegy on "The right noble Lord, William, Earle Pembroke his death," and the other two lament the death of Henry Sydenham and of Giles Bampfild. Pembroke died on March 17, 1569/70; the other elegies inform us that Sydenham and Bampfild were drowned in "Irishe streame" while with the army of the Earl of Essex, and this places their death in 1573.<sup>2</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> *The Booke of Faulconrie or Hawking*, for the Onely Delight and pleasure of all Noblemen and Gentlemen: Collected out of the best authours, as well Italians as Frenchmen, and some English practises withall concernyng Faulconrie. . . . By George Turberulle Gentleman. . . . Imprinted at London for Christopher Barker, at the signe of the Grashopper in Paules Churchyarde. Anno. 1575."

<sup>2</sup> According to the *D.N.B.* Essex sailed with his army from Liverpool on July 19, 1573, and Turberville tells us that his friends were drowned in a storm before the army had disembarked.



*Tragical Tales*, then, must have been published about 1574, not long before the *Booke of Faulconrie*. Unfortunately the Stationers' Registers for this period are lost.

There is still further proof for the priority of the *Tales* to the *Faulconrie*. Not only is the *Faulconrie* omitted in Melpomene's list of books published by Turberville,<sup>1</sup> but in complimentary verses prefixed to the *Tales*, Robert Baynes prophesies:

The same who vewes, shall find his lines, with learned reason dight.  
And as to elder age, his stayed braine shall grow:  
So falling from, his riper penne, more graue conceites may flow,

verses which if written in 1587 would have been absolutely ridiculous. Furthermore, in verses prefixed to the *Faulconrie*, Baynes refers specifically to the ten tragical histories:

The Booke so done, as neede no whit, the wryters name empare.  
VVhose noted skill so knowne, whose penne so had in price,  
As credite yeeldes, eche worke of his, that falles from his deuce.  
Among the which, though this doth differ from his lore:  
From grauer stuffe a pause it is, to sharpe his wittes the more.

Some of the "Sonnettes" printed in the last part of the *Tales* seem to have been composed in Russia, and one of them, "A farewell to a mother Cosin, at his going towards Moscouia," claims to have been written in June, 1568. It was natural that Turberville should have collected these older poems and added them to his newer poems in 1574 to fill out the volume of translated tales.<sup>2</sup>

Turberville's other work of this period was "*The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*. . . . Translated and collected for the pleasure of all Noblemen and Gentlemen, out of the best approued Authors." The book has no imprint,<sup>3</sup> but the dedication to Sir Henry Clinton is signed by C[hristopher] B[arker], a distinguished printer. "The Translator to the Reader," also unsigned, is dated June 16, 1575.

<sup>1</sup> This list, from the *Tales*, is quoted on pp. 516-17, above.

<sup>2</sup> *Censura Literaria*, 2d ed., I, 318, informs us (and has the usual number of followers) that "to the latter edition [i.e., of 1587, an earlier edition of 1576 being assumed] of the *Tales* were annexed 'Epitaphs and Sonets.'" This is absurd: even Turberville would hardly have added epitaphs on men who had been dead for fifteen years.

<sup>3</sup> This at least is the case with the facsimile reprint issued in the "Tudor and Stuart Library," Oxford, 1908; but the copy formerly in the Hoe Library (*Catalogue*, IV, 295) had the imprint, "Imprinted by Henry Bynneman, for Christopher Barker."



The work, however, is everywhere attributed to Turberville,<sup>1</sup> and is usually found bound with his *Booke of Faulconrie*. With this book Turberville's literary career may have come to an end; there is no proof that he wrote anything more, although various later works have been attributed to him. These attributions will not be discussed here.

### III

The "troubles" to which Turberville so often refers have aroused some interest in his biographers, although no one has attempted to show what his troubles were. The *Tragical Tales*, not content with informing us on the title-page that it was written "in time of his troubles," constantly reminds us of them. The dedication, "To the Worshipfull his louing brother, Nicholas Turberuile, Esquire," declares that "these few Poeticall parers [*sic*], and pensiuë Pamphlets" are "the ruful records of my former trauel, in the sorowful sea of my late misaduentures: which hauing the more spedily by your carefull and brotherly endeouour, ouerpassed and escaped, could not but offer you this treatise in lieu of a more large liberalitie." Then in a long epistle "To his verie friend Ro. Baynes," Turberville remarks:

VWherein if ought vnworth the presse thou finde  
Vnsauorie, or that seemes vnto thy taste,  
Impute it to the troubles of my minde,  
Whose late mishap made this be hatcht in haste,  
By clowdes of care best beauties be defaste.

He also adds that

in my life I neuer felt such fittes,  
As whilst I wrote this worke did daunt my wittes.

Even to Melpomene he announces that

late mishaps haue me bereft  
my rimes of roisting ioye:  
Syth churlish fortune clouded hath  
my glee, with mantell blacke,  
Of foule mischaunce, wherby my barke  
was like to bide the wracke.

<sup>1</sup> H. G. Aldis (*Cambridge Hist. Eng. Lit.*, IV, 389) says: "It was at the instance and expense of Christopher Barker that Turberville undertook the compilation of *The noble arte of venerie or hunting* (1575), the publisher himself seeking out and procuring works of foreign writers for the use of the compiler."

The troubles to which Turberville referred were, as I have shown, over by 1575. And what were they? Not sickness, for the dedicatory epistle to the Earl of Warwick shows that sickness followed, but was not a part of, his troubles. Nor had they begun as early as 1568. By that time Turberville had attained great prominence as a poet, and in 1568 he was chosen by Randolph as secretary for the embassy to Russia, a post of some honor. If, however, Turberville's "Farewell to a mother Cosin," a poem in the *Tales*, was actually written before he left for Russia, he was either deliberately feigning melancholy or else his troubles had begun. To his mother he writes that "cruel fortune will never smile on me," "my country coast would never allow me one good luck," "I have spent all my years in study, and yet have never got a better chance."

Sith I haue livde so long,  
and neuer am the neere,  
To bid my natiue soile farewel,  
I purpose for a yeere.  
And more perhaps if neede  
and present cause require.

It seems more probable that this poem was composed after Turberville had returned to England, for there is certainly no trace of sorrow or melancholy or trouble in the other poetical letters that he sent from Russia to various English friends.<sup>1</sup>

After reading the woebegone love songs that are added to the *Tales*, one might be tempted to believe that Turberville's troubles were only those of the heart. One, for example, begins:

Wounded with loue, and piercing deep desire  
Of your faire face, I left my natiue land.<sup>2</sup>

Others have such titles as "That though he may not possible come or send, yet he liues mindfull of his mistresse in Moscouia"<sup>3</sup> and "To one whom he had long loued, and at last was refused without cause,

<sup>1</sup> According to Randolph's own account of the embassy (in Hakluyt's *Voyages*, 1589, pp. 339 ff.), he had about forty in his company, "of which the one halfe were Gentlemen, desirous to see the world." It was probably a spirit of adventure that led Turberville to accompany Randolph. He can hardly have been having any deep-rooted trouble when he could stop his metrical tale of woe to assure his mother:

"Put case the snow be thicke,/and winter frostes be great:  
I doe not doubt but I shal finde/a stoue to make me sweat!"

<sup>2</sup> Page 315.

<sup>3</sup> Page 302.

and one imbraced that least deserued it."<sup>1</sup> In many of his poems Turberville is frankly, or better, naively, autobiographical; but at the end of the *Tragical Tales* he takes occasion explicitly to warn his readers against misinterpreting these love poems, adding "The Authors excuse for writing these and other Fancies, with promise of grauer matter hereafter." "My prime," he says, "prouokt my hasty idle quill To write of loue, when I did meane no ill." Ovid, whose every "leafe of loue the title eke did beare," encouraged him; and besides, he lived in the Inns of Court among sundry gallants who were victims of love,

And being there, although my minde were free,  
Yet must I seeme loue wounded eke to be.

Many of these gallants, he continues, had persuaded him to write poems for them to send to their own mistresses, until

So many were the matters, as at last  
The whole vnto a hansom volume grewe:  
Then to the presse they must in all the hast,  
Maugre my beard, my mates would haue it so.

He concludes with the assurance that "I meane no more with loutes deuise to deale."<sup>2</sup>

Evidently, then, hopeless love was not Turberville's trouble—but it would be interesting to know what share his wife had in his penning this public apology. For when the *Tales* was published Turberville was certainly married. In a jingle called "To his Friend Nicholas Roscarock, to induce him to take a Wife," Turberville writes that since his own "raging prime is past" he is now sending an epistle which

toucheth mariage vow,  
An order which my selfe haue entred now.

If I had known this sacred yoke earlier, he says,  
Good faith, I would not wasted so my prime  
In wanton wise, and spent an idle time

as "my London mates" still do. Koepfel was pleased by this letter, because it made him feel that happier days came to the poet after

<sup>1</sup> Page 336.

<sup>2</sup> In his preface "To the Reader" in the *Epitaphes* (1567) Turberville had made a similar disclaimer: "By meere fiction of these fantasies, I woulde warne (if I myghte) all tender age to flee that fonde and filthie affection of poysoned and unlawful love." He admits, however, "my selfe am of their yeares and disposition."

his marriage: "Das klingt uns nach den vielen klagen T.'s tröstlich zu ohren und lässt uns hoffen, dass auf seinen weiteren lebensweg, der sich unseren blicken entzieht, manch freundliches licht gefallen sein wird."<sup>1</sup> But Turberville had evidently found an old proverb true: he was complaining of his troubles just after he had married! Unhappily for Koepfel's theory, furthermore, instead of expressing only delight with marriage, in verses that follow those quoted above, Turberville writes like a confirmed woman-hater and a cynic. You may not wish to marry, he tells Roscarock, until you find a maiden who is "both yong and faire, with wealth and goods," but that is foolish:

Be rude by me, let giddy fansie go,  
 Embrace a wife, with wealth and coyne enough:  
 Force not the face, regard not feature so,  
 An aged grandame that maintains the plough,  
 And brings thee bags, is woorth a thousand peates  
 That pranck their pates, and liue by Spanish meates.

It is to be hoped that, however hard looking Mrs. Turberville may have been, she at least brought heavy bags to her troubled husband.<sup>2</sup>

But not all the blame for the poet's "fittes" can be thrown on his wife. It is possible that he was suspected of complicity in the Northern Rebellion of 1569. One thinks, in this connection, of the epitaph Turberville wrote on William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, a nobleman whose alleged sympathy for the rebel earls led to his ruin. Furthermore, Turberville may have been a Catholic, as the State Papers of the period are full of references to Dorsetshire Turberviles who were summoned before the Privy Council to answer charges of non-conformity; and this alone would have brought him into suspicion. Some probability is added to this conjecture by the obvious anxiety Turberville showed, in his dedication of the *Book of Falconry*, to stay under the protection of the Earl of Warwick, who in September, 1573,

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 55.

<sup>2</sup> Nobody can doubt that this is one of Turberville's autobiographical poems. He was evidently intimately acquainted with Roscarock, who, according to the "Authors Epilogue" (*Tales*, pp. 401-2), was responsible for the publication of the book:

"Roscarockes warrant shal suffice, who likte the writing so,  
 As did embolden me to let/the leanes at large to goe.  
 If it succede, the blame was his/who might haue kept it backe:  
 And frendly tolde me that my booke/his due deuse did lacke."

had been made a member of the Privy Council. However this be, I can point out two happenings that might well have "troubled" our poet.

The first is sufficiently explained by this entry in the *Acts of the Privy Council*<sup>1</sup> for March 29, 1571:

A letter to the Vicount Bindon and others, &c., Justices of Peax in the countie of Dorset, where the Quenes Majestie by her owne letters signified that her pleasure was they shuld cause certaine numbers of men to be in redines to serve upon further warning to be gyven unto them, and also were by letters amonges other thinges advertised from their Lordships that her plesure was they shuld make choise of such fit persons to have the leading of them as for their experience and other qualities agreable thereunto might be thought hable to take such a charge upon them; forasmuch as they are informed that contrary to her Majesties expectation and their order they have made choise for the leading of one hundred soldiours as well of one Hughe Bampfild, a man besides his old yeres farre unfitte to take such a charge upon him, having not ben imploied in like service, as also of George Turberville, who hath ben alwaies from his youth, and still is, gyven to his boke and studie and never exercised in matters of warre; lyke as they can not but finde it strainge that emongest such a number of fitt men as they know are to be found out in that countie they wold committe the same to persons farre unfitte for that purpose, so they are required to make sume better choise for the furniture of her Majesties service, or els to signifie why they can not do so, to thintent they may upon knowledge thereof take such furdur order for the supply of their wantes as they shall find convenient.

Hugh Bampfild, here described as old and unfit for military service, was Turberville's uncle, and to him the poet, in terms of great respect and affection, had dedicated the *Eglogs*. It is easy to see how the order of the Privy Council would deeply have humiliated Turberville, and his abortive attempt at a soldier's life no doubt caused him to abandon the translation of Lucan's warlike poem. The deaths of Giles Bampfild—perhaps the son of Hugh and a cousin of the poet<sup>2</sup>—and Henry Sydenham soon followed.<sup>3</sup> Turberville was

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Dasent, VIII, 21-22.

<sup>2</sup> In the *Tales*, p. 356, Turberville remarks:

"The second neere vnto my selfe allyde,  
Gyles Bamfield hight, (I weepe to wryte his name)."

It may be noted also that George's paternal grandmother was Jane, daughter of Thomas Bampfild, of Somerset (Hutchins, *History and Antiquities of Dorset*, 3d ed., I, 139).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. p. 522, above.

evidently very fond of these men, for he included two mournful elegies on them in the *Tragical Tales*. Even ignoring the dubious Mrs. Turberville, here is humiliation and grief enough to trouble anyone.

## IV

If the date of the *Tragical Tales* could be pushed forward to 1587, there would be no difficulty in explaining the poet's troubles; for after 1576 they came, not single spies, but in battalions. In August, 1577, he had a quarrel with Sir Henry Ashley, which was of sufficient moment to attract the attention of the Privy Council.<sup>1</sup> On August 20, three years later, the Commissioners for Musters in Dorsetshire appointed a new captain for service in Ireland in place of Mr. George Turberville (he can hardly have been any other than the poet), who was "a great spurner of their authority."<sup>2</sup> But a far worse trouble had previously befallen him.

On March 17, 1579/80, Richard Jones, a London printer, licensed for publication *A dittie of master Turbervyle Murthered: and John Morgan that murdered him: with a letter of the said Morgan to his mother and another to his Sister Turbervyle*. The ballad itself is not extant, but the bare entry, though not before utilized, has high value for a biographer of George Turberville. Thomas Park,<sup>3</sup> to be sure, noticed that in Herbert's *Typographical Antiquities* the ballad was listed among Jones's publications, and half believed that the poet himself had been murdered; but (like the editor of the Edinburgh reprint of the *Tragical Tales*<sup>4</sup>) he was not wholly convinced, because Anthony à Wood<sup>5</sup> had specifically said that the poet was alive in 1594. Collier in 1849 commented under the entry of the ballad, "This is supposed to have been George Turberville, the poet."<sup>6</sup> But a few years later, because meanwhile he had read Wood's statement and because he believed that the *Tragical Tales* first appeared in 1587, Collier changed his mind.<sup>7</sup> Other writers have paid no attention to the ballad-entry.

<sup>1</sup> "A letter to Lord Marques of Winchester and the Justices of Assises in the countie of Dorset for the examining of a quarrell betwene Sir Henry Asheley and George Turbevill, gentleman, according to a minute remaining in the Counsell Chest" (*Acts of the Privy Council*, ed. Dasent, X, 14).

<sup>2</sup> *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, 1547-80, p. 673.

<sup>3</sup> *Censura Literaria*, 2d ed., I, 315.

<sup>4</sup> Page viii.

<sup>5</sup> *Athen. Ozon.*, ed. Bliss, I, 628.

<sup>6</sup> *Extracts from the Stationers' Registers*, II, 109.

<sup>7</sup> *Bibliographical Account*, II, 453.



As a matter of fact, the murdered Turberville was not George but Nicholas. For on February 18, 1579/80, the Privy Council instructed the Sheriff of Somerset to select a jury "of good and indifferent men for thenquiry and triall of the murther committed by Jhon Morgan upon Nicholas Turberville, esquire . . . and to have regard that the said Morgan may bee safely kept to bee forthcoming to awnswer unto justice."<sup>1</sup> Nine days later the Council ordered the release of one William Staunton who had been committed to prison "appon suspition that he shold have consented to that detestable fact," the murder, because it had been "credibly enformed that he ys not anywayes culpable therof," but directed that he be bound to appear at the Assizes.<sup>2</sup>

Now there were at least three Nicholas Turbervilles—the poet's father, his brother (to whom the *Tragical Tales* is dedicated), and his second cousin, Nicholas of Crediton. This cousin lived until 1616,<sup>3</sup> and a Nicholas Turberville of Winterbourne Whitchurch, who was surely, I think, the poet's brother, died shortly before August 7, 1584, when his estate was administered.<sup>4</sup> Only Nicholas, the poet's father, remains to be considered. He was sheriff of Dorset in the nineteenth year of Elizabeth's reign.<sup>5</sup> As his term had expired only a short time before the murder, this would account for the interest shown in the case by the Privy Council. His wife was a daughter of Morgan of South Mapperton,<sup>6</sup> hence merely from the title of the ballad it is clear that the murdered man was George Turberville's father, for it informs us that the murderer *Morgan* wrote a letter "to his *Sister Turbervyle*." Nicholas Turberville, then, was murdered by John Morgan, his brother-in-law—a tragedy that instinctively reminds one of the immortal descendant of this family, Tess of the D'Urbervilles.

<sup>1</sup> *Acts*, ed. Dasent, XI, 391.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 401.

<sup>3</sup> Hutchins, *History and Antiquities of Dorset*, 3d ed., I, 139.

<sup>4</sup> *Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries*, II, 89.

<sup>5</sup> Hutchins, *op. cit.*, I, xlii; Fuller's *Worthies*, ed. P. A. Nuttall, I, 472; *Acts of the P.C.*, X, 216.

<sup>6</sup> See the pedigrees in Hutchins, I, 139. There, by the way, the poet's brother Nicholas is not mentioned. Trolus, the elder brother, is said by Seccombe to have died in 1607; but Hutchins (I, 201) shows that his fourth and fifth sons were baptized at Winterbourne Whitchurch in 1607 and 1609; he died about July 8, 1609, when his estate was administered by his widow, Anne (*Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries*, II, 297).



Fortunately, further proof of this relationship is available. In Anthony Munday's lugubrious *View of sundry Examples, Reporting many straunge murthers* (1580)<sup>1</sup> is included an

*Example of John Morgan, who slew Maister Turberville in  
Somersetshire, 1580*

Likewise in Somersetshire, one John Morgan, by common report a lewd and wicked liver, and given to swearing, roysting, and all wickednes abounding in him, slew his brother in law, Maister Turberville, a gentleman of godly life, very sober, wise, and discreet, whose wife lying in childebed [this is probably an invention of Munday's], yet arose and went to have law and justice pronounced on that cruel malefactor. So, at Chard, before the Lord Chief Justice, hee was condemned and suffered death for his offence. 1580.

No one who has read this book can doubt that Munday may have manufactured incidents here, as he certainly did in his other "examples," to increase the effect of his story.<sup>2</sup> His account is important, however, because it proves that John Morgan was Nicholas Turberville's brother-in-law; and the pedigrees of Morgan and Turberville given in Hutchins' *Dorset* show beyond all question that Morgan's brother-in-law, Nicholas Turberville, was the poet's father.

The fact that Nicholas was murdered in Somerset, not in Dorset, is of no importance. Dorsetshire and Somersetshire adjoin each other, and indeed until the eighth year of Elizabeth's reign had formed one county.<sup>3</sup> The indictment itself charged that John Morgan, "gentleman, lately of Dorset, did in the aforesaid county strike and kill the said Turberville"—an ambiguous wording that later proved fortunate for Morgan's heirs.<sup>4</sup> Just when the murder occurred I have been unable to determine. The first mention I find of it is in the order of the Privy Council, February 18, 1579/80, already quoted. But there is a record that on January 27, 1579/80, the estate of Nicholas Turberville of Winterbourne Whitchurch,

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Collier, Old Shakespeare Society, 1851, pp. 85-86.

<sup>2</sup> One of his examples (p. 90) is of "A Woman of lix yeers delivered of three Children," each of whom at once made some such appropriate remark as "The day appointed which no man can shun."

<sup>3</sup> I have searched vainly through histories and records of Somerset for a Nicholas Turberville.

<sup>4</sup> See Sir George Croke's *Reports*, 1790, p. 101. Croke reports that the Queen's Bench (30 Elliza.) reversed the attainder and restored Morgan's estates to his heir, because the indictment was shown to be faulty: it charged Morgan with having killed Turberville in the "aforesaid county" (of Dorset), when Somersetshire was actually meant. Croke mistakenly gives the murderer's name as Thomas Morgan.

Dorset, was administered by his widow.<sup>1</sup> It can hardly be doubted that this Nicholas was the poet's father, and that he was murdered shortly before January 27. As for John Morgan, he was attainted, his estates were forfeited to the Crown, and he was hanged on March 14, 1579/80.<sup>2</sup> Three days later ballad singers were singing a lamentable ditty about his crime and execution through the streets of London.

In spite of their ancient and honorable ancestry—and long before the days of Tess—all the Turberviles were having evil fortunes. It seems probable that they were suspected of papistry and, as a corollary, of disloyalty to the Queen. On August 4, 1581, for example, Viscount Bindon, the nobleman to whom the *Heroycall Epistles* was dedicated,<sup>3</sup> was notified by the Privy Council "touchinge Turbervile of Beere, who cometh not to the churche, and . . . harbourethe one Bosgrave" to arrest both men and "to searche the house for bookes and other superstitious stuffe."<sup>4</sup> Francis Turberville, of Dorset, was outlawed in 1587 for "divers robberies committed";<sup>5</sup> Thomas was summoned before the Council in July, 1587, on the charge of aiding and maintaining felons;<sup>6</sup> Jenkin and his two sons, who lived in Wales, were Catholics and were suspected of harboring priests;<sup>7</sup> in March, 1591, Mr. Morgan<sup>8</sup> of Weymouth, Dorsetshire, was reported to be keeping a priest in his house, as was also "the sister-in-law of Turberville, who serves one of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland's daughters, and is much trusted by the Jesuits."<sup>9</sup> Many other instances of this sort could be cited, and while none of them may refer directly to the poet, they do refer to his kinsmen, and in some of them he was probably concerned.

On June 22, 1587, Turberville himself appeared before the Privy Council "to answeare certaine matters objected against him," and

<sup>1</sup> *Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries*, II, 54.

<sup>2</sup> Hutchins, *op. cit.*, II, 158. I have not traced the source whence the editors derived this date. They remark that John Morgan killed his brother-in-law, Nicholas Turberville, but do not attempt to indicate which Nicholas the murdered man was.

<sup>3</sup> John Turberville, of Bere and Woolbridge, married Lady Anne, Viscount Bindon's daughter, in 1608 (Hutchins, *op. cit.*, I, 154).

<sup>4</sup> *Acts of the Privy Council*, ed. Dasent, XIII, 150.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, XV, 96.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, XV, 164.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, XXVI, 310, 378 (November, December, 1596).

<sup>8</sup> The name *Morgan* suggests that the poet's relatives may have been aimed at in this report.

<sup>9</sup> *Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, 1591-94, III, 24.

was ordered "not to depart without special licence from their Lordships obtained in that behalfe."<sup>1</sup> Nicholas Turberville (George's cousin?) received similar orders on April 25, 1588.<sup>2</sup> What these charges were, I have no means of determining; but the poet was apparently exonerated, for on April 12, 1588, the Council sent a letter to the Lord Treasurer, notifying him that

whereas George Turvyle, gentleman, was appointed by the Earle of Warwycke to be the Muster Master in the countye of Warwycke under his Lieutenancy, therefore his Lordship was praied, accordinge unto a Privy Seale graunted unto his Lordship for those purposes, to paie or cause to be paie unto the said gentleman, by waye of imprest, the somme of fyfteeene poundes after tenn shillings the daye, to be allowed him for so many dayes as he should be employed in that service, allowing him for his repaier thether and his retorne hether againe so many daies as should suffice for that jorney.<sup>3</sup>

That Turberville was a *protégé* of the Warwicks is certain; in addition to the genuine gratitude he expressed to the Earl in the dedication of the *Book of Falconry*, he had previously dedicated "to his singular good Lady," the Countess of Warwick, the first and second editions of the *Epitaphes* and the *Plain Path to Perfect Virtue* (1568). It seems almost certain, then, that "George Turvyle, gentleman," was Turberville the poet; and that in 1588, as in 1574-75, the Earl had come to the help of his rhyming friend.

## V

On October 7, 1578, Nicholas Turberville, gentleman, was ordered to appear before the Privy Council for contempt of "the Commissioners appointed to deale betwene the prisonners of her Majesties Benche and their creditours," because he had repeatedly refused to appear before the Commissioners so that they could deal "with him in a cause betwene him and one Thomas Spencer, prisoner in the said Benche."<sup>4</sup> Presumably he appeared, but some time later the Council ordered Sir William Courtney and others to settle "certaine controversies touchinge matters in accompt betwene Nicholas Turberville and Thomas Spenser of Crediton in that countie of Devon" or to advise the Council which of the two was at fault.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Acts*, XV, 135. Seccombe, in the *D.N.B.*, has also noticed this record. Surely the poet is meant by the phrase "George Turberville of Wolbridge in the countie of Dorsett, gentleman."

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, XVI, 41.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, XVI, 31-32.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, X, 338-39.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, XII, 76 (June 29, 1580).

The Turberville here mentioned was probably Nicholas of Crediton, George's second cousin; but I have quoted these records only to suggest that Thomas Spencer, or another of his family, was the person addressed by George Turberville in the three poetical letters printed in the latter part of his *Tragical Tales*.<sup>1</sup>

Turberville addresses his friend merely as "Spencer," but Anthony à Wood<sup>2</sup> supplied the name "Edmund," believing that the letters were written to the *Faerie Queene* poet. Park<sup>3</sup> remarked that they were addressed to "Edmund Spenser (not the poet)"; but the editor of the Edinburgh reprint of the *Tales* in his preface declared that "one of the epistles . . . is inscribed to Edmund Spenser, with whom he [Turberville] was in habits of intimacy"! Collier, also, believed that Turberville was "a young friend of Spenser" and that he wrote the poetical epistle from Russia "in the very year [1569] when the author of the *Faerie Queene* was matriculated at Pembroke Hall, at the age of seventeen."<sup>4</sup> Turberville, it should be remembered, had left Oxford in 1561, when Spenser was nine years of age; and there is little probability, certainly no evidence, that he knew Edmund Spenser.

Koeppel nevertheless adopted Collier's view, and went much farther by distorting the lines in *Colin Clout*,

There is good Harpalus, now woxen aged  
In faithful service of faire Cynthia,

into an allusion to Turberville. He bases this interpretation on the altogether untenable grounds "dass T. auf der fahrt nach Russland der königin gedient hatte, und dass wir daher aus dem umstande, dass uns der dichter nach so vielen klagen plötzlich als glücklicher ehemann entgegentritt, ohne kühnheit schliessen dürfen, ein von der königin, Cynthia, gewahrter posten habe ihn der schlimmsten not des lebens entrissen; dass T. sicherlich *aged* war,"<sup>5</sup> and so on. None of these remarks can be substantiated. I have already shown that Turberville was "ein glücklicher ehemann" in the years 1573-74, just when he was complaining most bitterly of his troubles, and that his attempts to serve "Cynthia" in the army brought him only humilia-

<sup>1</sup> Pages 300, 308, 375. The last of these, with two other letters from Russia addressed "To Parker" and "To Edward Dancle," is also reprinted in Hakluyt's *Voyages*, 1589, pp. 408-13.

<sup>2</sup> *Athen. Ozon.*, ed. Bliss, I, 627.

<sup>3</sup> *Censura Literaria*, I, 314.

<sup>4</sup> *Bibl. Account*, II, 70, 453. Cf. also his *Spenser*, I, xxiii.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 59 ff. A third reason is "dass Harpalus sich in der silbenzahl mit dem namen unseres freundes deckt"!

tion and dismissal. There is no evidence to show that Cynthia ever aided him, nor is there any reason to believe him as "aged," say, as Thomas Churchyard; indeed, he was very probably dead when *Colin Clout* was published. There is also, I am well aware, no reason whatever for identifying the Thomas Spencer mentioned above with the Spencer of the poetical epistles; but nevertheless, the supposition that Turberville wrote to a Dorsetshire friend named Spencer, just as he wrote to other local friends named Parker and Dancie, is very reasonable. Koeppl's view is fanciful in the extreme.

## VI

Early bibliographers, after agreeing upon 1540 as the date of Turberville's birth,<sup>1</sup> pointed out that Thomas Purfoot's 1611 edition of the *Book of Falconry* announced on its title-page that it was "heretofore published by George Turberville, Gentleman. And now newly reviuied, corrected, and augmented, with many new Additions proper to these present times";<sup>2</sup> and hence gave 1610 as the year of his death. This date, given the weighty approval of the *Dictionary of National Biography*, is now generally accepted; so well accepted that the *Cambridge History of English Literature* puts a question mark after 1540, but omits it after 1610, although the former is the more accurate date. Seccombe, apparently following Ritson,<sup>3</sup> in his sketch in the *Dictionary of National Biography* gives the misleading statement that Turberville prefixed complimentary verses to Rowlands' *Lazarillo de Tormes* (1596), whereas Turberville was probably dead in 1596, and his verses appeared in the 1586 edition of Rowlands' translation.

Anthony à Wood wrote that Turberville "lived and was in great esteem among ingenious men, in fifteen hundred and ninety-four (36 reg. Elizab.),"<sup>4</sup> but he probably got this notion from an epitaph

<sup>1</sup> Because Wood says that Turberville was admitted scholar of Winchester College in 1554 at the age of fourteen. In the *Epitaphes* (Collier's reprint, p. 81) there is a poem entitled "The Lover to Cupid for mercede," which states that

"In greene and tender age,<sup>15</sup>  
(my Lorde), till xviii years,  
I spent my time as fitted youth  
in schole among my focaeres."

Wood, who on this point ought to be correct, tells us that the poet left Oxford in 1561; so that if Turberville's words be taken literally, he was born about 1543.

<sup>2</sup> See *Catalogue of the Hoe Library*, IV, 297.

<sup>3</sup> *Bibliographia Poetica*, p. 370. Rowlands' *Lazarillo* was licensed for publication by Colwell in 1568 and sold by him to Bynnenman on June 19, 1573 (Arber's *Transcript*, I, 378), who got out an edition in 1576.

<sup>4</sup> *Athen. Oxon.*, ed. Bliss, I, 628.

(presently to be quoted) written on Turbervile by Sir John Harington, and his very specifickness makes his accuracy doubtful. In other details of the poet's life Wood is notably inaccurate, and there is no particular reason for trusting him here. There is no proof whatever that in 1594 the poet was in great esteem among men, ingenious or otherwise. On the contrary, although new editions of his works were still appearing, by 1590 he was regarded as an antiquated writer of an unlettered age. His literary work was completed in 1576—at least records of later works are untrustworthy—and Elizabethan writers condescendingly referred to him and Gascoigne as authors of bygone days. "Maister Gascoigne," Nashe wrote in 1589, "is not to bee abridged of his deserued esteeme, who first beate the path to that perfection which our best Poets haue aspired to since his departure. . . . Neither was M. Turberuile the worst of his time, though in translating hee attributed too much to the necessitie of rime."<sup>1</sup> Gabriel Harvey's comment seems to be more important. He writes of Nashe: "Had he begun to Aretinize when Elderton began to ballat, Gascoine to sonnet, Turberuile to madrigal, Drant to versify, or Tarleton to extemporise, some parte of his phantasticall bibble-babbles and capricious panges might haue bene tollerated in a greene and wild youth; but the winde is chaunged, & there is a busier pageant vpon the stage."<sup>2</sup> Elderton's first known ballad appeared in March, 1559/60; he was certainly dead by 1592, and probably a year or two earlier. Gascoigne came into prominence as a poet in 1573 and was dead by 1577; Drant died about 1578 and Tarlton in 1588. Does it not seem as if Harvey had chosen for comparison with Nashe only dead authors whom he held in contempt? My own feeling is that Turbervile was dead by 1593; at any rate he was far from being in great esteem. Robert Tofte would hardly have written in 1615 the following passage if Turbervile had died only five years before: "This nice Age wherein wee now liue, hath brought more neate and teirse Wits into the world; yet must not old George Gascoigne and Turberuill, with such others, be altogether

<sup>1</sup> Preface to Greene's *Menaphon*, Nashe's *Works*, ed. McKerrow, III, 319.

<sup>2</sup> *Pierces Supererogation*, 1593 (*Works*, ed. Grosart, II, 96). In *Have With You to Saffron Walden*, 1596 (*Works*, III, 123), Nashe wrote: "I would make his [Harvey's] eares ring againe, and haue at him with two staues & a pike, which was a kinde of old verse in request before he fell a rayling at Turberuile or Elderton." Comparison with Elderton certainly is not a sign of high esteem.



relected, since they first broke the Ice for our quainter Poets, that now write, that they might the more safer swimme in the maine Ocean of sweet Poesie."<sup>1</sup>

In the notes to the fifth book of his *Orlando Furioso* (1591) Sir John Harington wrote: "Sure the tale [of Geneura] is a prettie comicall matter, and hath beene written in English verse some few yeares past (learnedly and with good grace) though in verse of another kind, by *M. George Turberuil*."<sup>2</sup> This passage may well have been written two or three years before 1591, but in any case throws no light on the date of Turberville's death.<sup>3</sup> In *Palladis Tamia* (1598) Meres praised Turberville for his "learned translations" along with Googe and Phaer (who had long been dead), Golding, Chapman, Harington, and others;<sup>4</sup> and Allot included eight quotations from Turberville in his *England's Parnassus* (1600).<sup>5</sup>

It is almost certain, however, that Turberville was dead before 1598. In Sir John Harington's *Epigrams*<sup>6</sup> is printed

*An Epitaph in commendation of George Turbevill a  
learned Gentleman*

When times were yet but rude, thy pen endeavored  
To pollish Barbarisme with purer stile:  
When times vvere grown most old, thy heart persevered  
Sincere and just, unstain'd with gifts or guile.  
Now lives thy soule, though from thy corps dissevered,  
There high in blisse, here cleare in fame the vvhile;  
To vvhich I pay this debt of due thanksgiving,  
My pen doth praise thee dead, thine grac'd me living.

Harington himself died in 1612, and the epigrams were not written during the last three or four years of his life. They were, indeed, written during an interval of five or six years, and, although the exact date of this epitaph on Turberville cannot be determined, the limits of the epigrams as a whole can easily be fixed. Many of the epigrams (which were first published in their entirety in 1618) were written after Harington's *Metamorphosis of Ajax* (1596); No. 85 in

<sup>1</sup> *The Blazon of Jealousie*, 1615, p. 64.

<sup>2</sup> 1634 ed., p. 39.

<sup>3</sup> For a discussion of the *Comic Tales* supposed, because of Harington's note, to have been written by Turberville see *Censura Literaria*, I, 319, and Ritson's *Bibl. Poet.*, p. 370.

<sup>4</sup> Arber's *English Garner*, II, 102.

<sup>5</sup> Ed. Charles Crawford, p. 383.

<sup>6</sup> Book I, No. 42, 1633 ed. (added to *Orlando Furioso*, 1634 ed.).



Book II is entitled "*Ouids* confession translated into English for Generall Norreyes. 1593"; III, 26, is "In commendation of Master *Lewknars* sixt description of Venice. Dedicated to Lady Warwick. 1595"; II, 64 and 84 are on Thomas Bastard and apparently refer to his *Chrestoleros* (1598); and IV, 11, is on Thomas Deloney's *Gentle Craft*, which was licensed for publication at Stationers' Hall on October 19, 1597. The latest epigram that I have noted is one (IV, 10) on the execution of Essex (1601). But the majority of the epigrams were written during 1596-98.<sup>1</sup> It would be more reasonable, then, to date Turberville's death "1598?" (or even "1593?") than "1610?"

A contemporary elegy on Turberville, which has never been reprinted or even referred to by his biographers, is preserved in Sloane MS 1709, folio 270, *verso*. Judged as burlesque, the verses are not altogether stupid. They run:

W<sup>th</sup> tricklinge teares ye Muses nine, bewaile o<sup>r</sup> present woe,  
 W<sup>t</sup> Dreerye Drops of doleful plaintes o<sup>r</sup> sobbinge sorrowes shewe,  
 Put on y<sup>r</sup> mo'ninge weedes alas, poure forth your plaintes amayne,  
 Ringe owte, Ringe out Ringe out y<sup>e</sup> knell of Turberville whom crewell  
 death hath slaine, whom cruell death hath slaine  
 Resurrexit a mortuis, there is holy S<sup>t</sup> Frauncis, qui olim fuit sepultus,  
 non ipse sed magi hic stultus, so toll the bell,  
 Ding Donge Ringe out his knell.

Dinge Donge, cease nowe the bell, he loued a pot of stronge ale well.<sup>2</sup>

Apparently the author of this doggerel had for Turberville small esteem.<sup>3</sup>

HYDER E. ROLLINS

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

<sup>1</sup> McKerrow "guesses" that the epigrams which mention Nashe were written "ca. 1593" (*Nashe's Works*, V, 146).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. E. J. L. Scott's *Index to the Sloane MSS. in the British Museum*, 1904, p. 358. Scott dates the elegy "ca. 1605."

<sup>3</sup> I may add that in Harleian MS 49 there is a page (fol. 145<sup>v</sup>) blank save for the signature of George Turberville and a couplet in his autograph:

George Turbervyle

A Turbervyle a monster is that loveth not his frend  
 Or stoops to foes, or doth forget good turns and so I end.

My attention was called to this autograph by a note in Sir Frederick Madden's interleaved and annotated copy of Ritsaon's *Bibliographia Poetica* (p. 370), now in the Harvard College Library. Copies of the autograph couplet and of the elegy were furnished me through the courtesy of the Keeper of MSS in the British Museum.

From the *Sale Catalogue* (p. 25) of J. P. Collier's library, it appears that in an interleaved copy of his *History of English Dramatic Poetry* Collier had inserted a "stanza of 3 lines and signature of George Turberville, upon the title from the folio edition of Sir Thomas More's Works."

### THEODULUS IN SCOTS

Not far from 1504-5 a lively and abusive correspondence,<sup>1</sup> in verse, sprang up between William Dunbar, the Scottish poet, courtier, and free-spoken ecclesiastic, and his friend, Walter Kennedy, also reckoned a poet in his day, who rather piqued himself on his piety and his Celtic blood. They went to the business of "flyting," as they called it, with some thoroughness. Dunbar confides to his friend, Sir John the Ross, that Kennedy and Quintyne Schaw have been praising each other in an extravagant manner; he would be sorry, indeed, to get into a controversy with them—what he would write would be too dreadful; but if the provocation continues he may be forced to "ryme, and rais the feynd with flytting."

Kennedy quickly takes up the challenge on behalf of himself and his "commissar," Quintyne, demanding an apology and silence. Dunbar then begins the attack with a torrent of abuse against the "Iersche brybour baird" (vagabond Celtic bard). The battle is now on, and Kennedy replies with abuse no less torrential. "Insenswat sow," he calls Dunbar, in an obscure passage on which we shall be able to shed some light before we are through:

Insenswat sow, ceiss, fals Ewstace air!

And knaw, kene skald, I hald of Alathia [ll. 81-82].

He again demands penance from Dunbar and recognition of his own superiority as a poet. He then takes up the cudgels on behalf of "Erische" as the proper tongue of all true Scotsmen, and blames Dunbar for his and his ancestors' partiality to the English—a matter which he later develops at length—bids him, meanwhile, be off to England and perish. He then enters with some detail upon an imaginary genealogy of his opponent. In reply, Dunbar, with a liberal sprinkling of epithet, reminds his antagonist of two presumably discreditable passages in his past life at Paisley and in Galloway, taunts him with using

Sic eloquence as thay in Erschry vse [l. 243],

<sup>1</sup> J. Schipper, "The Poems of William Dunbar." *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Cl.* (Wien, 1892), Bd. 40, Abth. IV, pp. 50-99; on the date see especially p. 52.

and, after some description of Kennedy's personal appearance, concludes with a masterly picture of Kennedy's entrance into Edinburgh. Kennedy, as an offset, offers an exaggerated and unsavory account of Dunbar's sea voyage, and discusses at length the unpatriotic record of Dunbar's ancestors, contrasting it with that of his own forbears. In conclusion he advises Dunbar to get himself hanged in France, or, better still, to come home and be hanged at Ayr.

Who conceived the plan of collecting and publishing this correspondence is not known. There is a print of 1508 by Chepman and Myllar, a fragment of which is extant; there are, besides, three manuscripts, Bannatyne, Maitland, and Reidpeth. In none of these forms is the material ordered precisely as outlined above. The arrangement here adopted is Dr. Schipper's, which pays due regard to the internal evidence. With the help of such evidence the *Flyting* takes on some appearance of literary form; it seems to be reducible to some sort of order. Dunbar sounds the warning in three stanzas; Kennedy responds in three stanzas of the same metrical scheme. Dunbar opens the attack in three stanzas; Kennedy's reply covers sixteen stanzas, closing with one containing internal rhyme. Dunbar comes back with twenty-two stanzas in the same metrical scheme, closing, like Kennedy, with internal rhyme. Kennedy's last word is again of twenty-two stanzas. Following Kennedy's first reply (l. 48) and his second (l. 200) (but not his last), there is an appeal to

Iuge 3e now heir quha gat the war [worse].

If Schipper's arrangement is mainly right, there is certainly an approach to metrical regularity, to the "matching" of stanzaic arrangement. This, together with the appeal to the judge, and, indeed, the notion of collecting the correspondence soon after its composition and serving it up as a literary whole, has lent encouragement to the search for the literary origins of the "flyting."

It may very well be that such a search is supererogatory. Although of personal animosity between the "flyters" there may have been none at all,<sup>1</sup> there was difference of opinion in abundance. Politically there would be little sympathy between the Ayrshire Celt,

<sup>1</sup> Dunbar, in his *Lament for the Makaris* (ll. 89 ff.), speaks without malice of "gud Maister Walter Kennedy," now at the point of death.

Kennedy, at whose "Erische" Dunbar scoffs,<sup>1</sup> and the Lothian Saxon, sprung of a family traditionally favorable to the English, and himself the preferred servant of the King's English queen. Between the two men there was a temperamental difference no less striking: Kennedy, to judge from his works, was inclined to a piety which delighted in conformity to tradition; Dunbar, who had left the Franciscans to seek preferment at court as a secular priest, spoke lightly sometimes of religious matters, and told stories not wholly to the credit of his old order. Kennedy evidently had a kind of personal vanity (he styles himself "the rose of rhetoric," [l. 148]), which may well have tested the endurance of Dunbar, who belongs to the genus, at any rate, of Rabelais and Swift. Two such men needed no strong literary promptings to fall into controversy, even though they did not personally dislike each other, and went to it in great part for the amusement of the bystanders and the exercise of their own wits.

After Dunbar and Kennedy had shown the way, the "flyting" had considerable vogue as a court amusement. Skelton engaged in a "flyting" with Garnesche, and four of his "defenses" are extant, written or published, so he says, "by the kynges most noble commandment."<sup>2</sup> He ran at tilt also with Robert Gaguin, a French friar.<sup>3</sup> Sir David Lyndesay was called upon thus to bandy words with his sovereign, James V;<sup>4</sup> Lyndesay's answer, all that is extant, is a rather tame mixture of compliment and good, if grossly phrased, advice. Still later, Thomas Churchyard exchanged broadsides with one Camel, which ran into "surrejoindre unto rejoindre."<sup>5</sup> Between Alexander Montgomerie and Sir Patrick Hume, of Polwart, there was much "laidlie language loud and large," which greatly amused the royal author of the *Reulis and Cautelis*.<sup>6</sup> I cannot see in these

<sup>1</sup> Lines 49, 105 ff., 243 ff., 273.

<sup>2</sup> *The Poetical Works of John Skelton: Principally According to the Edition of the Rev. Alexander Dyce* (Boston, 1864), I, 132-53.

<sup>3</sup> *Garlande of Laurell*, *ibid.*, II, 186, 222. For what is possibly a fragment of the *Reule* against Gaguyn, see F. Brie, "Skelton-Studien," *Englische Studien*, XXXVII (1907), 31 f.

<sup>4</sup> *Early English Text Society*, XLVII, 563-65.

*The Contention betwyte Churchyard and Camell, upon David Dycers Dreame*, 2d. ed., 1565. See Robert Lemon, *Catalogue of . . . Printed Broad-sides in . . . Society of Antiquaries* (London, 1866), pp. 7-10. Cited by *Dictionary of National Biography*. The broadsides belong to the year 1552.

<sup>6</sup> James Cranstoun's *Poems of Alexander Montgomerie* (Scottish Text Society, 1887 [pp. 59-86]) has been superseded by the supplementary volume edited for the society by George Stevenson in 1910. The latter dates the "flyting" ca. 1582 (p. xxv).

works the direct imitation of Dunbar and Kennedy that some scholars profess to find,<sup>1</sup> though it is quite probable that the later "flyters" were aware of the classical example of the exercise in which they were engaging. Doubtless they derived some sort of literary sanction from it, but, of course, where the object is to stifle one's adversary in a cloud of unwholesome epithet, to deal above everything else in *personalities*, a great deal of literal copying from one's predecessors is not likely to be observable. In this sense, did Dunbar and Kennedy, in the first instance, have any literary models in mind when they set to work?

Analogues there are, of course, in abundance, from Ovid's *Ibis* and the *Lokasenna* to the sonnet war of Pulci and Matteo Franco. Our Germanic ancestors had a way of twitting each other, and quite possibly both Dunbar and Kennedy were familiar with similar practices among the Celts.<sup>2</sup> Brotanek finds the immediate impulse to the correspondence between Dunbar and Kennedy in the invectives of Poggio against his fellow humanists, Filelfo and Valla.<sup>3</sup> Poggio had visited England in 1419, and Gavin Douglas, at any rate, had some acquaintance with these very invectives.<sup>4</sup> It cannot be said that Brotanek's parallels really prove direct literary indebtedness on the part of the Scotsmen to the Florentine's quarrels, though it is quite within the range of possibility that his letters may have been known to either Dunbar or Kennedy or both, and even have supplied them with some abusive epithets—Poggio has plenty in good mouth-filling Latin—of which apparently they stood very little in need.

Models which Dunbar and Kennedy more nearly approach in form are provided by the many poetical controversies in Provençal and French. Schipper attributes the "künstlerische Idee" of the "flyting" to the influence of the *jeu-parti* and the *serventois*.<sup>5</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> As Brotanek and Brie.

<sup>2</sup> See *The Poems of William Dunbar* (Scottish Text Society, 1893), Vol. I, Introduction, by Æ. J. G. Mackay, pp. clx ff. Warton (p. 37) mentions some sort of poetical quarrel at the Court of Henry III (1272) between Henry de Avranches and a Cornish poet.

<sup>3</sup> *Untersuchungen über das Leben und die Dichtungen Alexander Montgomerie* (Wiener Beiträge [Wien und Leipzig, 1896]), pp. 100 ff.

<sup>4</sup> "And Poggius stude with mony girne and grone,  
On Laurence Valla spittand and cryand fy."

[*"Pallas of Honour,"* in *Poems of Gavin Douglas* (ed. Small, 1874), I, 47, ll. 13 f.]

<sup>5</sup> *William Dunbar, sein Leben und seine Gedichte* (Berlin, 1882), p. 64.

former seems to have been much the more common type in Northern France.<sup>1</sup> The challenger propounds his question; his opponent, keeping to the rhymes set him, chooses the side he will defend; then the argument passes back and forth through four stanzas (*coblas*), ending with an appeal by each party to a disinterested judge. Brotanek,<sup>2</sup> who accepts and develops Schipper's suggestion, cites three *jeux-partis*, one of which, by the way, is not French, but a Provençal *joc-partit*,<sup>3</sup> which contain a trace, but hardly more than a trace, of personal invective. Much more of this is found in the Provençal *tenso* and *sirventes*, which discuss, not a question carefully framed for debate, but things in general and personalities in particular. The *tenso* presents obviously analogous traits. Without necessarily implying personal hostility,<sup>4</sup> it deals freely in personalities: Albert de Malespine twits Raimbaut de Vaqueiras with having been wretched and hungry in Lombardy;<sup>5</sup> Sordel hopes that Blacatz may be hanged;<sup>6</sup> Uc de Saint-Circ and the Count of Rhodes accuse each other of avarice.<sup>7</sup> Even political discussions are not entirely absent from the *tenso*,<sup>8</sup> but for these the usual place is the freer form of the *sirventes*. Bertrand de Born's outgivings in this form on politics and the strenuous life are as engagingly personal as those of any modern candidate for office.<sup>9</sup> The *sirventes* did not presuppose an answer, but it sometimes drew one: the Dauphin of Auvergne defended himself against the taunts of Richard I of England.<sup>10</sup> Richard was himself the inheritor of a splendid troubadour tradition. But it seems highly improbable that either Dunbar or Kennedy could

<sup>1</sup> About two hundred examples survive; Voretzsch, *Altfranzösische Literatur* (Halle, 1913), p. 353. For detailed description of these literary types see Heinrich Knobloch, *Die Streitgedichte im Provenzalischen und Altfranzösischen* (Breslau, 1886); Ludwig Selbach, *Das Streitgedicht in der altprovenzalischen Lyrik* (Marburg, 1886); and A. Jeanroy, "La Tenson provençale," *Annales du Midi*, II (1890), 281 ff., 441 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Untersuchungen*, pp. 96 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Paul Meyer gives it in a French translation in his review of Levy's *Guilhem Figueira*, *Romania*, X (1881), 261 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Jeanroy, p. 452.

<sup>5</sup> Raynouard, *Choix des poésies originales des troubadours* (Paris, 1819), II, 193; cf. the *Flying*, ll. 269 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Knobloch, p. 16; cf. the *Flying*, ll. 545 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Bartsch, *Chrestomathie Provençale* (Elberfeld, 1880), p. 159.

<sup>8</sup> Knobloch, p. 19.

<sup>9</sup> Barbara Smythe, *Trobador Poets* (London, 1911), pp. 72 ff.

<sup>10</sup> Ida Farnell, *The Lives of the Troubadours* (London, 1896), pp. 56 ff.



have encountered any real tradition of this sort as late as the close of the fifteenth century. The *tençon* and *serventois* seem to have been little cultivated in Northern France,<sup>1</sup> where Dunbar might have met with them on his travels; the Provençal forms are a matter of the thirteenth century at the latest.

As we have already seen, the human impulse to quarrel, in fun or fact, which has found frequent literary expression in the past, was perhaps aggravated in the case of Dunbar and Kennedy by political and temperamental differences between the two men. For further prompting they may have known the letters of Poggio, which, however, offered little or nothing in the way of literary form; this they might have had from certain Romance forms, with which, however, it is difficult to believe they could have had much acquaintance. Any literary form which would suggest the notion of a poetical contest, involving a certain metrical symmetry, with a more or less explicit appeal for a decision between the contestants, would provide all the literary stimulus and sanction that the "flyters" would need. That they had definitely in mind a well-known work which possessed these characteristics, however great or little its actual influence upon them may have been, I shall now undertake to demonstrate.

We return to Kennedy's dark utterance, to which passing reference has already been made:

Insenswat sow, ceiss, fals Ewstace air!  
And knaw, kene skald, I hald of Alathia.<sup>2</sup>

The lines have hitherto proved a puzzle, the cause of much fruitless speculation among the editors.<sup>3</sup> The difficulty lies with the proper names. Why is Dunbar called "false Eustace's heir," and who or what is "Alathia"?

Æneas J. G. Mackay, who writes the Introduction in the Scottish Text Society edition, includes the name "Eustase" among the "Historical Notices of Persons Alluded to in Dunbar's Poems," "but

<sup>1</sup> Gaston Paris, *Littérature française au moyen âge* (Paris, 1905), p. 202; Knobloch, p. 52; Voretzsch, p. 353.

<sup>2</sup> Schipper, *Denkschriften*, etc., XL, 65, ll. 81-82; *The Poems of William Dunbar* (ed. John Small) (Scottish Text Society, 1893), II, 21, ll. 321-22; *The Poems of William Dunbar* (ed. H. Belyse Balldon) (Cambridge, 1907), p. 74, ll. 81-2.

<sup>3</sup> Schipper, quoted above, is printing from the Bannatyne MS. The variants give no help: "Eustase air" (Chepman and Myllar), "Eustace fair" (Reidpeth); "Alathya" (Maitland).



who false Eustase was has not been discovered."<sup>1</sup> Concerning Alathia, Dr. Walter Gregor, in his notes to the same edition,<sup>2</sup> exhibits considerable classical learning not greatly to the point:

*Alathya*, *Alethis* = probably ἀλήθεια, Truth, in contrast with "fals Eustase air." Probably a figure in some masque was so called. Or is *Alathya* = *Ilithyia*, Εἰλαΐθια, the goddess of the Greeks who aided women in childbirth, Lat. *Juno Lucina*, and the poet means to say that he knows everything about the genealogy and birth of his opponent, as if he had the information from the goddess who assisted at his birth?

Schipper (*loc. cit.*) quotes Mackay as to Ewstace and for the explanation of Alathia resorts, not to mythology, but to logic:

Murray, *A New Engl. Dict.*, explains *alethiology* as the doctrine of truth, that part of logic which treats of the truth, and he quotes a passage from Sir W. Hamilton's (1837-1838) *Logic*, where the word occurs in this sense. Possibly the word *alethia* was in former times used as a logical term in a similar sense.

H. Bellyse Baildon, so far as I know the latest to comment on the passage, refrains from conjecture: "*Fals Ewstace air* (heir). It is not known to whom this refers . . . *Alathia*, Gk. ἀλήθεια, 'truth.'"<sup>3</sup>

All this is obviously desperate to the last degree. It is cited merely to show that the true meaning of this passage, if it could be hit upon, would be welcome. When it appears, it is not in the least recondite from the early sixteenth-century point of view.<sup>4</sup> Kennedy's

<sup>1</sup> I, ccxx.

<sup>2</sup> III, 54-55.

<sup>3</sup> P. 255.

<sup>4</sup> Dr. Gregor's "*Ilithyia*" is much too recondite. Sixteenth-century poets much later than Dunbar and Kennedy share with those of the Middle Ages the desire to have their allusions understood. Of *Daphne*, Chaucer is at pains to tell us

"I mene nat the goddesse Diane,

But Peneus doughter, which that highte Dane" [*Cant. Tales*, A 2063 f.].

The hint puts us straight. No one is going to miss Sackville's allusion to sleep, in the "Induction" to the *Mirror for Magistrates*, as

" . . . . . esteeming equally

Kyng Cresus pompe, and Irus pouertie" [Skeat, *Specimens*, p. 293].

simply because he doesn't remember who Croesus and Irus were, much less that Ovid had already contrasted them (*Tristia* III. 7. 42). Where no hint is given the resemblance may safely be taken as intended to be of the most general sort, as when Skelton compares Mistress Margaret Tyney to Canace and Phaedra (*Garlande of Laurell*, ll. 906 ff.); the common term is merely the "goodness" of the mediaeval "good woman." Too much learning is sometimes a dangerous thing. Douglas, in the *Palice of Honour*, says that among these lovers and their ladies—

"There was Arcyte and Palemon aswa

Accompanyit with fair Aemilia" [p. 22, ll. 25 f.];

whereupon Small solemnly assures us that Aemilia was a vestal virgin who miraculously rekindled the sacred fire!

allusion means little or nothing, unless it is recognized. He is not merely calling names;<sup>1</sup> he is making a point; and for such a purpose he is hardly the man to risk a dark hint at pagan mythology or dubious school-logic. His own reading, we may guess, was largely of a devotional sort, for all he says he has "perambulit of Pernaso the montane" (l. 97). Of the readers of his own time he complains:

But now, allace! men ar mair studyus  
To reid the Seige of þe toun of Tire,  
The Life of Tursalem, or Hector, or Troylus,  
The vanite of Alexanderis empire.<sup>2</sup>

This, we may guess, is a fair sample of Kennedy's own reading in his more secular moods; it is not of a sort to encourage the kind of allusion his commentators would have him indulge in.

There is, however, one sort of book to which allusion could safely be made—a widely used schoolbook. A reference to *Cato* would not have gone astray. Such another book is the *Ecloga Theoduli*, a Carolingian Latin poem of the ninth century.<sup>3</sup> Furnished with a commentary, it was frequently recommended as a textbook during the later Middle Ages.<sup>4</sup> Of this famous work Osternacher lists no less than one hundred and twenty-one MSS, twenty-five printed editions before 1515, and as many more of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries bound up with other works, chiefly in the volume known as *Auctores Octo*. Subsequent research has made some additions to this list.<sup>5</sup> "Qua re dilucide probatur hunc auctorem illa aetate

<sup>1</sup> When he does that, his allusions are not always perfectly obvious; later, among the ancestors of "Deulbeir," he mentions "Vespasius thy ume" (l. 180):

"Herod thy vihr ume, and grit Egeass,  
Martiane, Mahomeit, and Maxentius . . .  
Throip thy neir neice and awsterne Olibrius,  
Pettetedew, Baall, and eke Ezobulus [ll. 185-89].

The name *Fermilus*, in *Passion of Christ* (l. 25), remains unexplained, though it is presumably biblical. See "Poems of Walter Kennedy" (ed. J. Schipper), *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-Hist. Cl. (Wien, 1902), Bd. 48, p. 26, and F. Holthausen, "Kennedy Studien," *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, CXII, 298.

<sup>2</sup> *Passion of Christ*, ll. 36-39.

<sup>3</sup> *Theoduli Eclogam recensuit* . . . Johannes Osternacher, *Ripariae prope Lentiam*, MDCCCII.

<sup>4</sup> On the vogue of *Theodulus* see two interesting papers by Professor G. L. Hamilton, "Theodulus, a Mediaeval Textbook," *Modern Philology*, VII (1909), 169 ff., and "Theodulus in France," *ibid.*, VIII (1911), 611 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Hamilton, *Modern Philology*, VII (1909), 180.

discipulis vulgo legendum praebitum esse."<sup>1</sup> Kennedy could hardly have missed it, nor could his contemporary reader.

It is not necessary to describe the *Theodulus* in detail. It is an *amoebaeen* pastoral, in which the shepherd Pseustis tells in hexameter quatrains (with single internal, not strictly leonine, rhyme) a story of classical mythology, as of Deucalion's flood, Hippolytus, Hercules, and the like, four lines to each. Each story is immediately capped by the shepherdess Alithia with an analogue, also told in four lines, from the Bible: Noah, Joseph, or Samson. Toward the close Pseustis begins to weaken, and finally the judge, Fronesis, intercedes on behalf of the defeated pagan. A later hand has added Alithia's closing hymn of triumph and praise.<sup>2</sup>

The reader has now doubtless availed himself of the opportunity to guess that the names of the contestants in the *Theodulus* solve the puzzle of Kennedy's unexplained reference. "Alathia" is Alithia and "Ewstace" was originally "false Pseustis," or as Kennedy is more likely to have written it, "fals Sewstis" (so Kennedy's contemporary, Barclay, spells the name).<sup>3</sup> Then "fals Sewstis" has become by wrong division "falss ewstis," or by a natural haplography "fals ewstis"; later this has undergone brilliant restoration to outward sense (at the hand of the transcriber?) in the form "fals Ewstace."<sup>4</sup> With this hint Kennedy's allusion appears as pat as can be. His adversary, whom he accuses of heresy and irreligion,<sup>5</sup> is the heir of Pseustis, or falsehood, the pagan opponent of orthodoxy or truth, which, in turn, is represented by Alithia, from whom Kennedy derives his inheritance, or, merely, on whose side he is to be found.<sup>6</sup> Here then, if

<sup>1</sup> Osternacher, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Dante runs a similar parallel between the Hebraic and the Hellenic up the seven terraces of Purgatory, but his examples, chosen to illustrate particular vices and virtues, differ from those of the *Theodulus*, where the ingenuity goes to the matching of analogous stories, except in the doubtless fortuitous instance of the coupling of Cain and Cecrops in the latter (ll. 53-60) and of Cain and Aglauros, daughter of Cecrops, in Dante (*Purg.*, XIV, 130-39).

<sup>3</sup> See below.

<sup>4</sup> Such distortion of the name is not surprising. Henri d'Andell's *Bataille des sept arts* has Sextis and Malicia in both MSS; see L. J. Paetow, *Memoirs of the University of California*, IV (1914), 1, Plates V and IX. The printer betrays even Professor Hamilton, at the moment of referring to this point, into seeming to write *Pseustis* himself, *Modern Philology*, VII (1909), 182.

<sup>5</sup> "Lollard lawreat" (l. 172), "lamp Lollardorum" (l. 196), "primas Paganorum" (l. 197), he calls him.

<sup>6</sup> See *New English Dictionary*, s.v. "hold," 19, 21. Kennedy's insistence on his own orthodoxy rules out the possibility that he might have come upon the names Pseustis

nothing else, is a bit of text cleared up and another literary allusion to a famous book restored to a place between Chaucer's "dan Pseustis"<sup>1</sup> and Barclay's

. . . . father auncient,  
Which in briefe language both playne and eloquent,  
Betwene Alatheia, Sewstis stoute and bolde  
Hath made rehearsall of all thy storyes olde,  
By true historyes vs teaching to obiect  
Against vayne fables of olde Gentiles sect.<sup>2</sup>

I have no wish to force a parallel between the form of the *Theodulus* and the *Flyting*; they are not in result at all the same thing. But it is fair to note that the *Theodulus* offers, with its poetical contest, its "matched" stanzas, and its appeal to the judge, everything in the way of literary suggestion that the "flyters" could have required for a start. Such suggestion might have come, as we have already seen, from a variety of sources; it might have come from the vernacular *débat*, upon which, as Professor Hanford has recently shown,<sup>3</sup> the *Theodulus* was an important influence. But over all the possible sources which have been put forward for the work of Dunbar and Kennedy the *Theodulus* itself now has the immense advantage of being certainly known to them. It provides a thread, if a slender one, which leads us back through the Carolingian *conflictus*, to the *amoebaeon* song of Vergil and Theocritus. It is not without significance that the road back to the classics lies through the Middle Ages.

HARRY MORGAN AYRES

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

and Alithia in Wickliff's well-known *Dialogus* (ed. Gotthardus Lechler, Oxon., 1869), where the three disputants bear the names of the characters of the *Ecloga*. Wickliff's Alithia approvingly elicits from Phronesis, who is a lecturer rather than a judge, statements concerning the sacraments and the clergy, particularly in Book IV, which Kennedy would certainly repudiate.

<sup>1</sup> *House of Fame* (l. 1228). *Atiteris* in the preceding line is certainly not *Alithia*. Holthausen's suggestion (*Anglia*, XVI, 264 ff.) of *Tityrus* is most apt. Perhaps the initial *A* is really due to some confusion with *Alithia*, of whom the scribe or author would be likely to think in this connection.

<sup>2</sup> *Certaine Egloges of Alexander Barclay, Priest*, reprinted from the edition of 1570 for the Spenser Society (1885), No. 39, p. 1. Eclogue IV mentions the death of Sir Edward Howard, in 1513, so that Barclay's allusion is presumably later than Kennedy's.

<sup>3</sup> "Classical Eclogue and Mediaeval Debate," *Romanic Review*, II (1911), 16-31, 129-43.

## THE RELATION OF SPENSER AND HARVEY TO PURITANISM

The relation of Spenser to Puritanism has been discussed by various investigators during recent years. Some of the writers do not recognize the fact that, even if we can make sure that Spenser was a "Puritan," our inquiry is then only begun, not ended. For the words "Puritan" and "Puritanism" covered a very wide range of meaning. A recent paper by Professor F. M. Padelford brings this out with great clearness. He points out that the employment of these terms in sixteenth-century England resembles the indiscriminating use of the words "socialist" and "socialism" at the present time. He says:

Such diverse personalities as Archbishop Grindal, Bishop Cox, the Earl of Leicester, Sir Philip Sidney, and Thomas Cartwright are all denominated Puritans, or credited with Puritan sympathies. Yet Grindal regarded Cartwright as a dangerous fellow who was poisoning the minds of the young men of Cambridge; Bishop Cox did not hesitate to class the Puritans with the Papists as very anti-Christ; and, to borrow a suggestion from Matthew Arnold, fancy the distress of Sidney or of Leicester if he had found himself confined for a three months to the "Mayflower," with only the Pilgrim Fathers for a solace! Like "socialism" today, "Puritanism" in the sixteenth century was a relative matter.<sup>1</sup>

A favorite opinion in recent years has been that Spenser was an extreme Puritan, presumably a Presbyterian at heart. He must have had some contact with the great Presbyterian leader of that day, Thomas Cartwright, who returned to Cambridge as Margaret professor of divinity in 1569, the very year when Spenser entered the University, matriculating at Pembroke Hall. The view that Spenser was an extreme Puritan is advocated by James Russell Lowell,<sup>2</sup> Lilian Winstanley,<sup>3</sup> and James Jackson Higginson.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Spenser and the Puritan Propaganda," *Mod. Phil.*, XI, 85-106.

<sup>2</sup> "Spenser," *Prose Works*, Vol. IV, Riverside ed., Boston.

<sup>3</sup> "Spenser and Puritanism," *Mod. Lang. Quar.*, III, 6-16, 103-10.

<sup>4</sup> *Spenser's Shepherd's Calendar* (Columbia University Press, 1912), pp. 38-162.

That Spenser was Calvinistic in his theology is entirely probable. Miss Winstanley presents evidence in support of the following assertions:

The Church in its earlier days was Calvinistic in its theology, and Puritanism was only an attempt to reduce it to the Calvinistic model in other respects. . . . We may say generally that Spenser accepted the Calvinism which was, as has been pointed out, the common creed of the day.<sup>1</sup>

The more recent study of Professor Padelford<sup>2</sup> confirms these statements.

But I cannot believe that Miss Winstanley is correct when she concludes that Spenser was also opposed to episcopacy: "On the question, then, that was after all the main point at issue in Elizabeth's reign—the question of church discipline—Spenser sided as strongly as possible with the Puritans."<sup>3</sup>

Dean R. W. Church<sup>4</sup> and Professor T. W. Hunt<sup>5</sup> oppose this view. They hold that Spenser was not hostile to episcopacy, but that he favored a purified Anglicanism. This is the opinion of Professor Padelford in an article already cited.<sup>6</sup>

An important piece of evidence was unknown to those writers already mentioned who believed that Spenser was an "out-and-out Puritan," that he "threw himself heart and soul into the cause of Cartwright."<sup>7</sup> In a paper read before the British Academy on November 29, 1907, Dr. Israel Gollancz told of a collection of books of travel bound together which formerly belonged to Gabriel Harvey. One of these books, *The Traveiler of Ierome Turler* (1575), has upon its title-page the following inscription in Harvey's handwriting: *Ex dono Edmundij Spenserij, Episcopi Roffensis [=of Rochester] Secretarij*, 1578.<sup>8</sup> The reviewer of Higginson's book in the *Nation* for November 21, 1912 (p. 486), comments as follows:

Before this simple fact the whole elaborate structure of Mr. Higginson's interpretation of the tale of the Shepherd Roffy or Roffynn, his dog Lowder,

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 8-9.

<sup>2</sup> "Spenser and the Theology of Calvin," *Mod. Phil.*, XII, 1-18.

<sup>3</sup> P. 16.

<sup>4</sup> *Spenser*, "English Men of Letters" series (Macmillan, 1879), *passim*.

<sup>5</sup> "Edmund Spenser and the English Reformation," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXVII, 39-53.

<sup>6</sup> "Spenser and the Puritan Propaganda." See above.

<sup>7</sup> Higginson, p. 152.

<sup>8</sup> Winstanley, p. 13.

<sup>9</sup> See *The Athenaeum*, December 7, 1907, p. 732.



and the Wolf, in the September eclogue, virtually crumbles to pieces. The discovery makes it plain that Grosart was right in identifying the shepherd with Young, Bishop of Rochester, who had previously been Master of Pembroke Hall (Spenser's own college) at Cambridge. . . . Still further, Spenser's relations to Young have a direct bearing on Mr. Higginson's theory in regard to the poet's supposed bitter hostility towards Anglicanism. The fact that Spenser was a Puritan in his views—at least in his early life—is not open to serious question; but would a thoroughgoing Anglican like Young have appointed the poet to so confidential a position as that of private secretary if the views of the latter had been so extreme as our author [Higginson] assumes? It is to be remembered that Young had been master of Spenser's college through the whole seven years of the poet's residence there, so that he could not possibly have been ignorant of Spenser's opinions in matters of religious doctrine and church government.

Since the present article was first written, Dr. Percy W. Long has published an important paper upon "Spenser and the Bishop of Rochester."<sup>1</sup> Dr. Long holds that Spenser's "rise from the rank of poor scholar, his moral and ecclesiastical ideas, and much of his early poetry were immediately conditioned by his close affiliation with the Bishop of Rochester."<sup>2</sup> The facts set forth in the article, many of them newly discovered, make this conclusion entirely probable. Spenser's connection with Bishop Young shows that he cannot have been an extreme Puritan, an enemy of the episcopal system.

I wish to advocate the view that Spenser was always a Low-Churchman. Even in *The Shepheardes Calender* and *Mother Hubberds Tale*, presumably composed at about the same time, there is evidence to confirm this opinion. The three eclogues of the *Calender* which are plainly and primarily concerned with church affairs are those for May, July, and September. In the first two of these Archbishop Grindal is praised under the name of "Algrind" or "Algrin"; in the September eclogue, as we have seen, Bishop Young is praised as "Roffynn," "Roffy." Line 176,

Colin Clout, I wene, be his selfe boye,

seems to mean that Spenser was in Young's employ when this eclogue was written. A well-known line in the April eclogue also (l. 21) applies to Bishop Young and Spenser:

Colin thou kenst, the Southerne shepheardes boye.

<sup>1</sup> *Publications of Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, December, 1916, pp. 713-35.    <sup>2</sup> P. 735.

We note that Spenser shows very special admiration for Archbishop Grindal in *The Shepheardes Calender*. On June 24, 1569, one month after Spenser matriculated at Cambridge, "Cecil received a letter from Grindal, recently installed as Archbishop of York, who strongly denounced the 'love of contention and liking of novelties' with which he heard that Cartwright had disturbed the University, and advocated his expulsion unless he conformed."<sup>1</sup> Is it likely that Spenser, the admirer of Grindal, favored the views of this same Cartwright, the arch-Presbyterian? Later in this paper we shall find Gabriel Harvey, Spenser's close friend, opposing Cartwright by name.

In a gloss to line 121 of the May eclogue E. K. seems to accept episcopacy as a satisfactory system. There is no good reason to suppose that he is insincere in these words, or that he misrepresents Spenser's meaning. He says:

*Some gan, meant of the Pope, and his Anti-christian prelates, which usurpe a tyrannical dominion in the Churche, and with Peters counterfet keyes open a wide gate to al wickednesse and insolent government. Nought here spoken, as of purpose to deny fatherly rule and godly governaunce (as some malitiously of late have done, to the great unreste and hinderaunce of the Churche) but to displaye the pride and disorder of such as, in steede of feeding their sheepe, indeede feede of theyr sheepe.*

I feel confident that "fatherly rule" in this passage applies especially to the rule of the bishops, the spiritual fathers. Professor Padelford so interprets it.<sup>2</sup> Higginson believes, strangely enough, that those who "malitiously of late" have denied "fatherly rule and governaunce" are "the Anabaptists, with whom the Puritans disclaimed any connection."<sup>3</sup>

The following lines in *Mother Hubberds Tale* are evidently meant to satirize zealous, solemn-visaged Puritans:

First therefore, when ye have in handsome wise  
Yourself attyred, as you can devise,  
Then to some Noble man your selfe applye,  
Or other great one in the worldes eye,  
That hath a zealous disposition  
To God, and so to his religion:  
There must thou fashion eke a godly zeale,

<sup>1</sup> Higginson, pp. 21-22.

<sup>2</sup> *Mod. Phil.*, XI, 103.

<sup>3</sup> P. 81.

Such as no carpers may contrayre reveale:  
 For each thing fained, ought more warie bee.  
 There thou must walke in sober gravitee,  
 And seeme as Saintlike as Saint *Radegund*:  
 Fast much, pray oft, looke lowly on the ground,  
 And unto everie one doo curtesie meeke:  
 These lookes (nought saying) doo a benefice seeke,  
 And be thou sure one not to lacke or long.

[LL. 487-501.]

Book II of *The Faerie Queene* may well have been written, at least in an early form, before Spenser went to Ireland. Canto II of that book tells us of the sour, discontented Elissa and her like-minded lover, Sir Huddibras, of the "comely courteous dame," Medina, who symbolizes the golden mean, and of the wanton Perissa with her bold lover, Sansloy. Elissa and Sir Huddibras are a plain satire upon the ultra-Puritans. Samuel Butler took from this canto the name of Elissa's lover, Huddibras, for the title of his great satire upon Puritanism, *Hudibras*, and for the name of the central figure.<sup>1</sup> Butler interpreted Spenser's allegory at this point as directed against the extreme Puritans.

Even those who believe that Spenser was an out-and-out Puritan at one time are forced to assume that he changed his views somewhat in later years. Let us look at the passages which compel them to admit this.

Near the end of Book VI of *The Faerie Queene*, published in 1596, one portion of the career of the Blatant Beast is thus described:

From thence into the sacred Church he broke,  
 And robd the Chancell, and the desks downe threw,  
 And Altars fouled, and blasphemy spoke,  
 And th' Images for all their goodly hew,  
 Did cast to ground, whilst none was them to rew;  
 So all confounded and disordered there.

[VI, xii, 25.]

Ben Jonson told Drummond that "by the Blating Beast the Puritans were understood."<sup>2</sup> It is quite certain that it is they who are satirized in these lines.

<sup>1</sup> *Cambridge History of English Literature*, VIII, 73.

<sup>2</sup> *The Works of Ben Jonson* (Gifford-Cunningham ed.), III, 478.

The writings of Spenser that appeared after his death contain two distinct expressions of antipathy to the Puritan extremists. One of these concerns their manners; the other, their teachings. In the fragments of *The Faerie Queene* which were published in 1609, and which are usually assigned to Book VII, a crab is described as going backward,

as Bargemen wont to fare  
Bending their force contrary to their face,  
Like that ungracious crew which faines demurest grace.

[Canto vii, stanza 35.]

In his prose *View of the Present State of Ireland*, first printed in 1633, Spenser says concerning the church edifices of that country:

Next care in religion is to builde up and repayre all the ruinous churches . . . for the outward shewe (assure your selfe) doth greatlye drawe the rude people to the reverencing and frequenting thereof, what ever some of our late to nice fooles saye—"there is nothing in the seemelye forme and comely ordere of the church."

Lowell, Miss Winstanley, and Mr. Higginson recognize that these passages last quoted show Spenser to have been out of sympathy with ultra-Puritanism during his later years. They all assume that a change has come over him, and suggest reasons for the supposed transformation. But a simpler and more probable view is that there never was any fundamental alteration in Spenser's attitude toward Puritanism, that he always was a Church Puritan, an earnest, zealous Low-Churchman.

The considerations that have so far been presented are not new, but it seemed best to indicate them briefly for the sake of completeness. The main purpose of this paper is to call attention to a source of evidence concerning Spenser's attitude toward Puritanism which has been neglected. The friendship between Edmund Spenser and Gabriel Harvey was so intimate and unclouded that I feel confident of a substantial agreement in their religious views. Harvey has given somewhat full expression to his religious convictions. Can we fairly cite his utterances as representing the opinions of Spenser also?

About the close and life-long sympathy between the two friends there can be no mistake. I have already noted that Spenser made a

<sup>1</sup> *The Globe Spenser*, p. 680; *Todd's Spenser*, VIII, 503-4.

present of Turler's *Traveiler* to Harvey in 1578. The Bodleian Library possesses a copy of *Howleglas* which, together with other books, Spenser gave to Harvey conditionally on December 20, 1578. A note by Harvey in the volume records a list of all the books concerned and a boyish wager made between the two men.<sup>1</sup>

*The Shepheardes Calender*, 1579, closes with the lines addressed to Harvey:

Adieu good *Hobbinol*, that was so true,  
Tell *Rosalind*, her *Colin* bids her adieu.

The published letters that passed between the friends in 1579 and 1580 manifest the good understanding between them. A sonnet of Spenser, dated at Dublin, July 18, 1586, expresses warm admiration for "Harvey, the happy above happiest men." When the first three books of *The Faerie Queene* appeared in 1590, they were accompanied by a charming poem of commendation from "Hobynoll," who rejoices that "Collyn" has turned

From rustick tunes, to chaunt heroique deeds.

In the prefatory matter prefixed to Harvey's *Pierces Supererogation*, 1593, Barnabe Barnes mentions "divinest morall Spenser" as the honored friend of Harvey.<sup>2</sup>

In *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*, 1595, Hobbinol still figures as Colin's closest friend:

At last when as he piped had his fill,  
He rested him: and sitting then around,  
One of those groomes (a iolly groome was he,  
As ever piped on an oaten reed,  
And lov'd this shepherd dearest in degree,  
Hight *Hobbinol*) gan thus to him areed.

[Ll. 10-15.]

It is practically certain that this close, harmonious intimacy between the two men, apparently extending over the last thirty years of Spenser's life, could not have existed without substantial agreement on religious questions. Mr. Higginson shows us that the University of Cambridge was "at all times during Elizabeth's reign a hotbed of Puritanism" (p. 20), and that, during Spenser's stay there,

<sup>1</sup> *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia*, ed. by G. C. Moore Smith (Stratford-upon-Avon, 1913), p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Grosart's *Harvey*, II, 24.

it was, next to London, "the chief centre of Puritan agitation" (p. 30). Spenser had been at Cambridge two and one-third years when, in September, 1571, "Whitgift as Master of Trinity expelled Cartwright from his fellowship in that college on the ground that he had not taken priest's orders."<sup>1</sup> It is probable that the popularity of his opponent was one reason for Whitgift's action. Cartwright was so popular as a speaker that, when his turn came to preach, the windows at St. Mary's had to be taken down, so that the crowd upon the outside might listen.<sup>2</sup> We have direct evidence that the poet was interested in the agitation that was carried on by Cartwright. In a published letter to Spenser, Harvey, writing from Cambridge, recalls the vestment controversy of former days, in which Cartwright was prominent: "No more adoe aboute *Cappes* and *Surplesses*: Maister Cartwright nighe forgotten."<sup>3</sup>

With religious controversy so clamorous and omnipresent at Cambridge, it is entirely improbable that Spenser and Harvey could have maintained complete friendship and sympathy unless their religious views were harmonious and upon all fundamental questions substantially identical.

But we are not confined to this reasoning from general probability. There is some corroborative evidence. We know from the letters to Dr. John Young, Master of Pembroke Hall, preserved in Harvey's *Letter-Book*,<sup>4</sup> that the younger scholar relied upon the elder as his faithful friend. Presumably Dr. Young never failed him. In 1573 some of the Fellows of Pembroke Hall put a technical obstacle in the way of Harvey's obtaining his M.A. degree. Dr. Young was absent at the time; but, says Professor G. C. Moore Smith, he "came down to Cambridge in person, and in a few days crushed all opposition."<sup>5</sup> This statement is a matter of inference, but is practically certain.

Early in 1578 this same Dr. Young became Bishop of Rochester. As already noted, the new bishop made Spenser his secretary. There is no longer any doubt that the poet praises Young in the September

<sup>1</sup> Higginson, p. 22.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 30.

<sup>3</sup> *The Oxford Spenser*, p. 621; Grosart's *Harvey*, I, 71.

<sup>4</sup> Printed for the Camden Society, 1884.

<sup>5</sup> *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia*, Introduction, p. 12.



eclogue of *The Shepheardes Calender* as "Roffynn," "Roffy." Hobbinol says in line 176:

Colin Clout, I wene, be his [Roffynn's] selfe boye.

I have used this evidence before to show that Spenser was probably a loyal churchman, though a Low-Churchman. I wish to point out here that the friendship of Bishop Young for both Harvey and Spenser furnishes distinct corroboration of the presumption that the two men were agreed in their views about religion. I have yet to show affirmatively what were Harvey's religious opinions.

The evidence to be submitted will prove that Gabriel Harvey was a broad-minded Low-Churchman. I like to call him a Church Puritan. I consider that Professor Padelford is correct in calling Spenser "a consistent advocate of the golden mean in matters ecclesiastical";<sup>1</sup> but it can be plainly demonstrated that the phrase describes Harvey. In 1573, when some of the Fellows of Pembroke Hall, as already noted, sought to prevent Harvey from obtaining the M.A. degree, one of the charges brought against him was that he "had greatly commendid thos whitch men call praecisions and puritanes." This looks like accusing Harvey of being liberal-minded; and the nature of his spirited reply makes it quite probable that there was some ground for the charge. He says:

As for puritanes I wuld fain know what those same puritanes ar and what qualities thai have, that I have so hihly and usually commendid. Let M. Phisician name the persons and then shew that I have praised them, in that respect thai ar puritanes or that ever I have maintainid ani od point of puritanism, or praecisionism mi self, and I shal be contentid to be bard of mi mastership and iointid of my fellowship too, yea and to take ani other sharp meddecine that his lerning shal iudg meetist for sutch a maladi.<sup>2</sup>

Much later Harvey was even suspected of being himself the mysterious Martin Marprelate.<sup>3</sup> Thomas Nash ridicules the suggestion that his enemy had "so much wit."<sup>4</sup>

As the Harvey family seem to have been very much of one mind, it is significant that Richard, Gabriel's clerical brother, in his *Lamb of God*, 1590, "seemed disposed to take a middle line between the

<sup>1</sup> *Mod. Phil.*, XI, 106.

<sup>2</sup> *Letter-Book of Gabriel Harvey*, pp. 29, 30.

<sup>3</sup> In *Pierces Supererogation*, Grosart's *Harvey*, II, 131.

<sup>4</sup> In *Have With You to Safron-Walden*, McKerrow's *Nash*, III, 138.

bishops and their opponents."<sup>1</sup> Both the *Dictionary of National Biography* and the *Cambridge History of English Literature* consider Richard Harvey to be the probable author of the anonymous pamphlet *Plaine Percevall*.<sup>2</sup> In this work he is said to be somewhat Puritan in his sympathies.

John Lyly sought to defend the English church from the attacks of Martin Marprelate by retorting in kind to that writer's slangy, lampooning attacks. Lyly's *Pappe with a Hatchet*, appearing anonymously late in 1589, contained a rap at Gabriel Harvey. Harvey wrote a reply entitled *An Advertisement for Papp-hatchett, and Martin Marprelate*. This bears the date of November 5, 1589. It was not published for four years. In 1593 Harvey brought out *Pierces Supererogation* as a part of his verbal war with Thomas Nash. Nearly one-third of this work consists of the foregoing *Advertisement*,<sup>3</sup> then first printed. Here in a hundred pages we get a full presentation of the views of Harvey concerning church polity.

I quote a summary and eulogy of this *Advertisement* from Professor G. C. Moore Smith:

[Harvey's reply to Lyly] contains a most serious treatment of the Marprelate controversy, in which Harvey's statesmanship, his independence of ecclesiastical prejudices, and his powers as a writer are seen to the highest advantage. He shows that a perfect system of Church Government is not to be had in a day, that the Primitive Church adapted itself to temporal circumstances, and that the creation of a theocracy represented by ministerial rule in every parish would be intolerable. The better scholar, he says, the colder schismatic. We must have mutual charity or Church and State will be overthrown. Perhaps nothing wiser or more far-sighted was ever written in the whole of the 16th century.<sup>4</sup>

Harvey's discussion certainly deserves hearty commendation, but when we recall that the completed portions of Richard Hooker's great work, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, appeared in 1594 and 1597, and that they were an outcome of this same general controversy, Professor Smith's praise of Harvey's *Advertisement* seems somewhat excessive.

<sup>1</sup> *The Dictionary of National Biography*.

<sup>2</sup> *Cambridge History of English Literature*, III, 613.

<sup>3</sup> Grosart's *Harvey*, II, 124-221.

<sup>4</sup> Introduction to *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia*, pp. 58, 59.

It will be best now to let Harvey speak for himself. Since only fifty sets of Grosart's edition of Harvey's works were printed, the passages quoted are not generally accessible.<sup>1</sup>

In cases indifferent, or arbitrary, what so equall in generall, as Indifferency: or so requisite in speciall, as conformity to the positive Lawe, to the custome of the Countrey, or to the present occasion? To be perverse, or obstinate without necessary cause, is a peevish folly: when by such a dutyfull and iustifiable order of proceeding, as by a sacred League, so infinite Variances, and contentions may be compounded. To the cleane, all things are cleane. S. Paule, that layed his foundation like a wise architect, and was a singular frame of divinity, (omnisufficiently furnished to be a Doctour of the Nations, & a Convertour of People) became all unto all, and as it were a Christian Mercury, to winne some. Oh, that his Knowledge, or Zeale were as rife, as his Name: and I would to God, some could learne to behave themselves toward Princes, and Magistrates, as Paul demeaned himselfe, not onely before the King Agrippa, but also before the twoo Romane Procuratours of that Province, Felix, and Festus: whome he entreated in honourable termes, albeit ethicke governours. Were none more scrupulous, then S. Paul, how easily, and graciously might divers Confutations bee reconciled, that now rage, like Civill Warres? The chiefest matter in question, is no article of beliefe, but a point of pollicy, or government: wherein a Iudicial Equity being duely observed, what letteth but the particular Lawes, Ordinances, Iniunctions, and whole manner of Iurisdiction, may rest in the disposition of Sovereaine Autoritie? [pp. 140-42].

May it therefore please the busiest of those, that debarre Ecclesiasticall persons of all Civill iurisdiction, or temporall function, to consider; how every pettie *Parish*, in England, to the number of about 5200. more, or lesse, may be made a Ierusalem, or Metropolitan Sea, like the noblest Cittie of the Orient, (for so Pliny calleth Ierusalem): how every *Minister* of the sayd Parishes, may be promoted to be an high Priest, and to have a Pontificall Consistorie: how every *Assistant* of that Consistorie, may emprove himselfe an honorable, or worshipfull Senior, according to his reverend calling: . . . how a *Princely and Capitall Court*, and even the high Councill of Parliament, or supreme Tribunall of a Royall Cittie, . . . how such a Princely, and stately Court, should be the patterne of a *Presbitery in a poore Parish*: how the Principalitie or Pontificalitie of a *Minister* according to the degenerate Sanedrim, should be sett-upp, when the *Lordship of a Bishop*, or Archbishop, according to their position, is to be pulled-downe: finally how the *supremacie over Kings*, and Emperours should be taken from the highest Priest, or *Pope*, to be bestowed upon an *ordinarie Minister*, or Curate: . . .

<sup>1</sup> The following extracts from the *Advertisement* are found in Grosart's edition of *Harvey*, Vol. II in the Huth Library, 3 vols., 1884-85; but here the modern *s* is used throughout, and the modern distinction between *s* and *u* is observed.

When these points are considered; if withall it be determined by evident demonstration, as cleere as the Sunne, and as invincible as Gods-word, that whatsoever the Apostles did for their time, is immutably perpetuall, and necessarie for all times: and that nothing by way of speciall respect, or present occasion, is left to the ordinaunce, disposition, or provision of the Church, but the strict and precise practise of their Primitive Discipline, according to some Precepts in S. Paules Epistles, and a few Examples in the Actes of the Apostles: *So be it*, must be the suffrage of us, that have no Voyce in the Sanedrim. All is concluded in a few pregnant propositions: we shall not neede to trouble, or entangle our wittes with many Articles, Iniunctions, Statutes, or other ordinances: the Generall, Provinciaall, and Episcopall Councels, lost much good labour in their Canons, Decrees, and whatsoever Ecclesiastical Constitutions: the workes of the fathers, and Doctours, howsoever auncient, learned, or Orthodoxall, are little, or nothing worth: infinite studdies, writings, commentaries, treatises, conferences, consultations, disputations, distinctions, conclusions of the most notable Schollers in Christendome, altogither superfluous. Well-worth a few resolute Aphorismes; that dispatch more in a word, then could be boulded-out in fifteen hundred yeares; and roundly determine all with an *Upsy-downe*. . . . Now if it seeme as cleere a case in Pollicie, as in Divinitie; that one, and the same Discipline may serve divers, and contrarie formes of regiment, and be as fitt for the head of England, as for the foote of Geneva: The worst is, Aristotles Politiques must be burned for heretiques. But how happie is the age, that in stead of a thousand Positive Lawes, and Lesbian Canons, hath founde one standing Canon of Polycletus, an immutable Law of sacred government? And what a blissefull destinie had the Commonwealth, that must be the Modell of all other Commonwealthes, and the very Center of the Christian world? [pp. 143-47].

M. Calvin, the founder of the plott, (whome Beza stileth the great Calvin) had reason to establish his ministry against Inconstancy, and to fortify himselfe against Faction (as he could best devise, and compasse with the assistance of his French party, and other favorites) by enroaching upon a mechanicall, and mutinous people, from whose variable and fickle mutability he could no otherwise assecurer himselfe. As he sensibly found not onely by dayly experiences of their giddy and factious nature, but also by his owne expulsion, and banishment: whome after a little triall, (as it were for a dainety novelty, or sly experiment) they could be content to use as kindly, and loyally, as they had used the old Bishopp, their lawful Prince. Could M. Cartwright, or M. Traverse seaze upon such a Citty, or any like popular towne, Helvetian or other, where Democracy ruleth the rost: they should have some-bodies good leave to provide for their owne security; and to take their best advantage upon tickle Cantons. Some one peradventure in time would canton them well-enough; and give a shrewd pull at a Metropolitan Sea, as souveraine, as the old Bishoprike of Geneva. It were not the

first time, that a Democracy by degrees hath prooved an Aristocracy; an Aristocracy degenerated into an Oligarchy; an Oligarchy amounted to a Tyranny, or Principality. . . . I am no pleader for the regiment of the feete over the head, or the government of the stomacke over the hart: surely nothing can be more pernicious in practise, or more miserable in conclusion, then a commaunding authority in them, that are borne to obey, ordained to live in private condition, made to follow their occupations, and bound to homage. You that be schollars, moderate your invention with iudgement: and you that be reasonable gentlemen, pacify your selves with reason. If it be an iniury, to enclose Commons; what iustice is it, to lay open enclosures? and if Monarchies must suffer popular states to enioy their free liberties, and amplest franchises, without the least infringement, or abridgment: is there no congruence of reason, that popular states should give Monarchies leave, to use their Positive lawes, established orders, and Royall Prerogatives, without disturbance or confutation? [pp. 152-54].

Possession was ever a strong defendant: and a iust title maketh a puissant adversarie. Bishops will gooverne with reputation, when Marr-Prelats must obey with reverence, or resist with contumacie. Errours in doctrine; corruptions in manners; and abuses in offices, would be reformed: but degrees of superiortie, and orders of obedience are needfull in all estates: and especially in the Clergie as necessarie, as the Sunne in the day, or the Moone in the night: or Cock-on-hoope, with a hundred thousand Curates in the world, would proove a mad Discipline. Let Order be the golden rule of proportion; & I am as forward an Admonitioner, as any Precisian in Inghland. If disorder must be the Discipline, and confusion the Reformation, (as without difference of degrees, it must needes) I crave pardon. *Anarchie*, was never yet a good States-man: and *Ataxie*, will ever be a badd Church-man. . . . Equality, in things equall, is a iust Law: but a respective valuation of persons, is the rule of Equity: & they little know, into what incongruities, & absurdities they runne headlong, that are weary of *Geometrical proportion*, or distributive Iustice, in the collation of publike functions, offices, or promotions, civile, or spirituall. God bestoweth his blessings with difference; and teacheth his Lieutenant the Prince, to estimate, and preferre his subiectes accordingly. When better Autors are alledged for equalitie in persons Unequall; I will live, and dye in defence of that equalitie; and honour *Arithmetical proportion*, as the onely ballance of Iustice, and sole standard of government. Meane-while, they that will-be wiser, then God, and their Prince, may continue a peevish scrupulositie in subscribing to their ordinances; and nurrish a rebellious Contumacie, in refusing their orders. I wish unto my frendes, as unto miselfe: and recommente Learning to discretion, conceit to iudgment, zeale to knowledge, dutie to obedience, confusion to order, Uncertaintie to assurance, and Unlawfull noveltie to lawfull Uniformitie: the sweetest repose, that the Common-wealth, or Church can enioy [pp. 158-60].

Every Miller is ready to convey the water to his owne mill: and neither the high Priestes of Ierusalem, nor the Popes of Roome, nor the Patriarckes of Constantinople, nor the Pastors of Geneva, were ever hastie to binde their owne handes. They that research Antiquities, and inquier into the privities of Practises, shall finde an Act of *Praemunire* is a necessarie Bridle in some cases. The first Bishops of Roome, were undoubtedly vertuous men, and godly Pastors: from Bishops they grew to be Popes: what more reverend, then some of those Bishops; or what more Tyrannical, then some of those Popes? Aaron, and the high-Priestes of Ierusalem, and of other ceremoniall nations, were their glorious Mirrours; and they deemed nothing too-magnificall, or pompous, to breede an Universall reverence of their sacred autoritie, and Hierarchie. We are so farre alienated from imitating, or allowing them, that we cannot abide our owne Bishops; yet withall would have every Minister a Bishop, and would also be fetching a new patterne from old Ierusalem, the moother-sea of the high-Priesthood. So the world (as the manner is) will needes runne-about in a Circle: pull-downe Bishops; set up the Minister; make him Bishop of his Parish, and head of the Consistorie, (call him, how you list, that must be his place): what will become of him within a few generations, but a high Priest in a low Ierusalem, or a great Pope in a small Roome? And then, where is the difference betweene him, and a Bishop, or rather betweene him, and a Pope? [pp. 181-82].

How probable is it, they are now at their very best, and even in the neatest and purest plight of their incorruption, whiles their mindes are abstracted from worldly thoughts, to a high meditation of their supposed-heavenly Reformation: and whiles it necessarily behooveth them, to stand charily and nicely upon the credit of their integritie, sinceritie, precisenesse, godlinesse, Zeale, and other vertues? When such respects are over, and their purpose compassed according to their harts desier; who can tell how they, or their successours may use the Keyes; or how they will besturr them with the Sworde? If Flesh proove not a Pope Ioane; and Bloud a Pope Hildebrand, good enough. Accidents, that have happened, may happen agayne; and all things under the Sunne, are subiect to casualltie, mutabilitie, and corruption. At all adventures, it is a brave Position, to maintaine a Soverain, and supreme autoritie in every Consistorie; and to exempt the Minister from superiour Censure; like the high Priest, or greatest Pontiffe. . . . He had neede be a wise, and Conscionable man, that should be a Parliament, or a Chauncerie unto himselfe: and what a furniture of divine perfections were requisite in the Church, where so many Ministers, so many spirituall high Iustices of Oier, and Terminer: and every one a supreme Tribunall, a Synode, a Generall Councell, a Canon Law, a heavenly Law, and Gospel unto himselfe? If no Serpent can come within his Paradise, safe enough. Or were it possible, that the Pastor, (although a man, yet a divine man) should as it were by inheritance, or succession, continue a



Sainet from generation to generation: is it also necessary, that the whole company of the redoubted Seniors, should wage everlasting warre with the flesh, the world, and the Divell; and eternally remaine an incorruptible Areopage, without wound, or scarre? Never such a Colledge, or fraternitie upon Earth, if that be their inviolable order. But God helpe Conceit, that buildeth Churches in the Ayer, and platformeth Disciplines without stayne, or spott.

They complaine of corruptions; and worthily, where Corruptions encreche, (I am no Patron of corruptions): but what a surging sea of corruption would overflow within few yeares, in case the sword of so great and ample autoritie, as that at Ierusalem most capitall, or this at Geneva most redoubted, were putt into the hand of so little capacitie in government, so little discretion in Discipline, so little iudgement in causes, so little moderation in living, so little constancie in saying, or dooing, so little gravitie in behaviour, or so little whatsoever should procure reverence in a Magistrate, or establish good order in a Commonwealth. Travaile thorough ten thousand Parishes in England; and when you have taken a favourable vew of their substantiallest, and sufficientest Aldermen, tell me in good sooth, what a comely shewe they would make in a Consistorie; or with how solemne a presence they would furnish a Councell Table. . . . I deny not, but the short apron may be as honest a man, or as good a Christian, as the long gowne: but methinkes he should scantily be so good a Iudge, or Assistant in doubtfull causes: and I suppose, *Ne sutor ultra crepidam* is as fitt a Proverbe now, as ever it was, since that excellent Painter rebuked that sawcie Cobler [pp. 184-87].

If Bishops-gate be infected, is it impossible for Alders-gate to be attainted? and if neither can be long cleere in an Universall plague of Corruption, what reason hath Zeale to fly from Gods blessing into a warme Sunne: What a wisdom were it, to chaunge for the worse? or what a notorious follie were it, to innovate, without infallible assurance of the better? What Politique state, or considerate people, ever laboured any Alteration, Civill, or Ecclesiasticall, without Pregnant evidence of some singular, or notable Good, as certaine in consequence, as important in estimation? To be short, . . . had Martin his lust, or Penry his wish, or Udal his mynde, or Browne his will, or Ket his phansie, or Barrow his pleasure, or Greenwood his harts-desire, or the freshest Practitioners their longing, (even to be Iudges of the Consistorie, or Fathers Conscript of Senate, or *Domine fac totum*, or themselves wott not what); there might fall-out five hundred practicable cases, and a thousand disputable questions in a yeare, (thè world must be reframed anew, or such points decided) wherewith they never disquieted their braynes, and wherein the learnedest of them could not say A. to the Arches, or B. to a Battledore. If the graver motioners of Discipline (who no doubt are learned men, and might be wiser: but M. Travers, M. Cartwright, Doctour Chapman, and all the

grayer heads begin to be stale with these Noovellists) have bethought themselves upon all cases, and cautels in Practise, of whatsoever nature, and have thorowly provided against all possible mischiefs, inconveniences, and irregularities, as well future, as present; I am glad they come so well prepared: surely some of the earnestest and egest sollicitours, are not yet so furnished [pp. 207-8].

Hans Berli, at the close of his full and able discussion of the work of Gabriel Harvey, tells us: "Er war Humanist und Puritaner."<sup>1</sup> But simply to call him a Puritan leaves many questions unanswered. He was a broad-minded Low-Churchman, accepting and defending the episcopal system, but with no illusions about it, and no extreme views. At times he shows a liberality of mind and a grasp of fundamental questions that remind us of Bishop Hooker himself.

There can be little doubt that Spenser's position was substantially identical with that of Harvey. The poet appears to have been more aggressively hostile than his friend to abuses in the church. I believe that the intensity of Spenser's reforming zeal has helped to mislead some careful students as to his fundamental position.

ALBERT H. TOLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

<sup>1</sup> *Gabriel Harvey, der Dichter-freund und Kritiker*, Dissertation (Zürich, 1913), p. 146.

## REVISIONS IN THE ENGLISH MYSTERY PLAYS

In discussions concerning the interrelations of the English mystery plays some misapprehension seems to proceed from the initial assumption that the text of an entire cycle may periodically have been subjected to revision. Thus, for example, Professor F. W. Cady,<sup>1</sup> in trying to establish his theory that the direct borrowings from the York cycle are the latest additions to the Towneley plays<sup>2</sup>—later even than the Wakefield group of plays—assumes that two editors, the first writing in couplets and the second in quatrains, successively revised the text of the whole cycle.

With this theory I am unable to agree for several reasons. In the first place, the characteristic nine-line stanzas of the Wakefield playwright, concerning which there is no diversity of opinion, are found in the T *Judicium*,<sup>3</sup> where they are obviously additions or insertions in an older play derived from Y. I say "obviously," because it is difficult to understand why the work of the author of the *Secunda Pastorum*<sup>4</sup> should be displaced by a less developed play from York, and also because the insertions, broadly comic in character, seem definitely intended to refurbish an older, more serious play. The Wakefield stanza, moreover, occurs in three other T plays much resembling Y: (1) in T 20, where the Wakefield playwright's lines (1-53) putting "snap" into Pilate's speech are immediately followed by stanzas in the meter of the so-called Y parent cycle;<sup>5</sup> (2) in T 16, which may be a rewriting of a York play (cf. Y 19); and (3) in T 22, the second half of which suggests Y 34, where the Wakefield dramatist contributes twenty-three stanzas, one of them, ll. 233-41, containing reminiscences of Y 34, ll. 26-35. When, therefore, the nature

<sup>1</sup> "The Couplets and Quatrains in the Towneley Mystery Plays," *Jour. Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, X, 572 ff. For another view see Pollard, *The Towneley Plays*, E.E.T.S., extra series, LXXI, Introduction, and Gayley, *Plays of Our Forefathers*, pp. 161 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Hereafter the Towneley plays will be designated by T and the York plays by Y.

<sup>3</sup> T 30, stanzas 16-48 and 68-76. Cf. Pollard, *op. cit.*, pp. xx ff.

<sup>4</sup> His work is undisturbed in T 3, 12, 13, 16, and 21, and is apparently used for the purpose of embellishment in T 20, 22, 24, and 30.

<sup>5</sup> Whether or not one accepts Davidson's conclusions concerning the presence in Y of a parent cycle, there can be no question but that the septenar stanza is identified with early plays in Y. Cf. Davidson, *English Mystery Plays*, pp. 137 ff.

of the Wakefield playwright's contributions is considered—his specialties seem to have been demons, torturers, Herods, and Pilates—one can hardly, I think, regard them as remnants of older work, afterward replaced by heavy lines from Y, in one instance by lines from a Y play of the earliest type.

The so-called editorial couplets, moreover, are found in only a small number of plays, a fact which might indicate that the hypothetical editor labored upon only a part of the cycle or that, as Pollard and Gayley plausibly assume, these couplets are survivals of an earlier stage in the history of the T plays.

Finally, that the couplets and quatrains are "editorial" in the sense assumed, i.e., that they are the work of a late reviser who had all or most of the plays in hand and rewrote or edited parts of them, appears to me questionable.

An investigation of the problem of revisions in the plays may perhaps shed some light upon the subject of the interrelations of the cycles. As suggested above, it has been widely assumed that at various times additions were made to the cycles *in toto*. This might indeed have been the case had all the plays remained in the custody of one man or of one group of men. It would seem, however, that whoever may have been responsible for the cycles originally,<sup>1</sup> the plays themselves reposed in the hands of the guilds,<sup>2</sup> and that in towns where the crafts were charged with the task of producing the pageants they also supervised the revisions of the text.

<sup>1</sup> The city accounts of Coventry for 1584 record a payment to Mr. Smythe of Oxford "for hys paynes for writing of the tragedye xliij vj<sup>s</sup> viij<sup>d</sup>," which shows that at this late date, in any case, a wholly new play for all the guilds was provided by the city. Cf. Sharp, *A Dissertation on the Pageants or Dramatic Mysteries Anciently Performed at Coventry*, 1825, p. 40. At Coventry the pageants for special occasions also seem to have been provided by the city (cf. extracts from the Cov. Leet Book published in *E.E.T.S.*, extra series, LXXXVII, 114); but who supplied the "new plays" mentioned in the *Annals* for 1519-20, I have been unable to discover. Cf. Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage*, II, 358, and Craig, *Two Coventry Corpus Christi Plays*, *E.E.T.S.*, extra series, LXXXVII, xxi.

<sup>2</sup> In places like Shrewsbury, New Romney, Lydd, Ipswich, and Norwich before 1527, where the corporation or a particular guild assumed full charge of all the plays, different conditions would of course obtain (cf. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage*, II, 118). No cycles seem to survive from such towns, unless the *Ludus Coventriae* be identified with Lincoln (cf. H. Craig in *The Athenaeum*, August 16, 1913). Madeleine Hope Dodds, however, has recently suggested that interpolations from some five different sources have been added to an old N-town cycle, and that this eclectic cycle emanates from the pen of a clerk of Bury St. Edmunds (*Med. Lang. Rev.*, 1914, pp. 79 ff.). Cf. also Hemingway, *English Nativity Plays*, pp. xxviii ff. and F. A. Foster, *A Study of the Middle-English Poem Known as The Northern Passion*, Bryn Mawr Dissertation, 1914, pp. 97 ff.

Thus at Coventry, several guilds independently employed Robert Croo to amend their plays for them;<sup>1</sup> the accounts of the Smiths record that in 1506 they "resevyd amonge bredren and other good ffelewys toward the Orygynall ij s. ix d.";<sup>2</sup> the accounts of the Cappers and Drapers detail various payments for songs;<sup>3</sup> those of the Cappers mention disbursements "for writyng a parte for herre (?) person," "for pe matter of pe castell of emaus,"<sup>4</sup> etc.; and in the Smiths' Company's accounts an agreement is recorded whereby it is seen that one, Thom's Colclow, who is to have *pe Rewle of pe pajaunt*, is "to bring in to p<sup>e</sup> mast<sup>r</sup> on sonday next aft<sup>r</sup> corp<sup>s</sup> xpi day p<sup>e</sup> originall,"<sup>5</sup>—the master of course being a guild officer.

At Norwich, where after 1527 the guilds became responsible for the plays, they seem to have taken charge of the texts also. In the books of the Norwich Grocers' Company were found two entirely different versions of their play dating from 1533 and 1565 respectively. In 1534 the Grocers paid to "S<sup>r</sup> Stephen Prowet for makyng of a newe ballet, 12<sup>d</sup>," and in 1563 their play was "preparyd ageynst y<sup>e</sup> daye of M<sup>r</sup> Davy his takyng of his charge of y<sup>e</sup> Mayralltye" with a "devyce" to be prepared by the surveyors at a cost of 6 s. 8 d.<sup>6</sup>

At Beverly in 1452 the Porters and Creelers were held responsible for a new pageant,<sup>7</sup> and the "worthier sort" in 1411 "should thenceforth . . . cause a fit and proper pageant to be made, and a fit play played in the same."<sup>8</sup> Apparently the city itself, however, paid for the composition of the banns—which naturally could devolve on

<sup>1</sup> The Drapers in 1557 paid "Robart Crowe for makyng of the boke for the paggen xx s." (Sharp, *op. cit.*, p. 67). In 1563 the Smiths gave him "vij d." "for ij leves of ore pley boke" (*ibid.*, p. 36). Our copies of the Shearmen and Taylors' and the Weavers' pageants show that in 1534 he "corrected" and "translated" for both these crafts.

The words, "makyng of the boke," and the like, which occur in the guild accounts from Coventry refer sometimes to copying, sometimes to writing. The sums expended, however, and the items accompanying the entry usually reveal which is intended. Compare the Drapers' accounts for 1572 (*ibid.*, p. 74) where x s. is paid "for wrytting the booke" with the entry in a *Chamberlain's Book of the City of York* (cited in Smith, *York Plays*, p. 18): "Item, payd to John Clerke for entryng in the Regystrer the Regynall of the paygant pertenyng to Craft of Fullars, which was never before regestred, 12 d." The largest amount spent for copying at Coventry seems to be 5 s., paid by each of three crafts in 1584 for the book of the *Destruction of Jerusalem* (Sharp, pp. 37, 65, 78).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 48, 64, 67.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15.

<sup>6</sup> Chambers, *op. cit.*, II, 118, 387, 388, 425.

<sup>7</sup> *Historical MSS Commission Reports, Beverly Corporation*, p. 136; A. F. Leach, "Some English Plays and Players" in *An English Miscellany*, p. 210.

<sup>8</sup> *Hist. MSS Comm., Bev.*, p. 67; Leach, *op. cit.*, p. 211.

no one guild—for in 1423<sup>1</sup> a friar preacher received 6 s. 8 d. for writing them.<sup>2</sup>

Our late accounts from Chester reveal the fact that there, too, although the city authorities might choose to exhibit their taste in the selection of the plays submitted to them, the initiative in the matter rested with the crafts. Thus in 1575 the plays were to be "sett furth" "with suche correction and amendemente as shall be thought conveniente by the saide maior, & all charges of the saide plays to be supported & borne by thinhabitaunts of the saide citie as have been heretofore used,"<sup>3</sup> a statement significantly interpreted by the accounts of the Smiths for the same year, which show that the guild submitted two alternative plays for the choice of the aldermen.<sup>4</sup>

Our manuscripts of the Chester plays are of course very late and all, with the exception of the *Hengwrt MS* of the *Antichrist* (play xxiv), date from a time many years after the cycle had ceased to be performed. That the plays had been subjected to some revision at the hands of guilds, however, is to be inferred from the composite nature of the plays themselves and, to a lesser extent, from a comparison of the list of plays in *Harl. MS* 2150, f. 85b,<sup>5</sup> of the pre-Reformation Banns,<sup>6</sup> of the post-Reformation Banns,<sup>7</sup> and of our versions of the plays.

That at York also the plays were not in the keeping of the city but in the charge of the crafts our manuscript of the official register bears witness. Thus three plays, which, according to Miss Smith,<sup>8</sup> were probably copied a few years later than the body of the manuscript, occupy an inserted quire at the beginning. In two places, blank pages have been left for the insertion of plays which we know

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. MSS Comm., Ser.*, p. 160; Leach, *op. cit.*, p. 215.

<sup>2</sup> At Sleaford, Lincolnshire (Chambers, II, 395), the accounts of the guild of the Holy Trinity for 1480 include "It. payd for the Ryginnall of ye play for ye Ascencion & the wrytyng of spechys and payntyng of a garmet for God lij<sup>e</sup>. vij<sup>e</sup>.", but it is uncertain whether a cycle existed at Sleaford.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. MSS Comm., Ser.*, p. 363, and Morris, *Chester during the Plantagenet and Tudor Reigns*, p. 321.

<sup>4</sup> Morris, *op. cit.*, p. 305, note: "1575. Spent at Tyer to heare 2 playes before the Aldermen to take the best, xviii<sup>e</sup>." Cf. Chambers, II, 355, and Spencer, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Chambers, II, 408, and Furnivall, *Digby Plays*, p. xxi.

<sup>6</sup> Morris, *op. cit.*, pp. 307-9.

<sup>7</sup> Deimling, *Chester Plays*, pp. 2-9, and Furnivall, *op. cit.*, p. xx.

<sup>8</sup> *York Plays*, p. xiv. Cf. also p. xvii.



from Burton's lists existed but which, for some reason, were never entered.<sup>1</sup> Three pieces, also on subjects known to Burton, were not added to the register until 1558,<sup>2</sup> and one of them, *The Fullers' Play*, as appears from the *Chamberlain's Book of the City of York*, never before was registered.<sup>3</sup> The late notes in the margins of the manuscript tell the same tale: evidently even in 1568, when the entire cycle was submitted to the reforming Dr. Matthew Hutton in the "happie time of the gospell," he had to be told that parts of the plays in it had been superseded. Note, for example, p. 93, "Doctor, this matter is newly mayde, wherof we haue no copy,"<sup>4</sup> the "copy" presumably being in the hands of the Spicers, who were responsible for the play.<sup>5</sup>

If the corporation had been responsible for the texts of the plays, such omissions would scarcely be intelligible. Nor can one understand the silence of the corporation documents on the subject of payments for "making the books." Not until 1568, so far as we know, did the corporation interfere and order an emendation of the whole, and it is evident<sup>6</sup> that this order and the orders of 1575 and 1579 were brought about by the sweeping changes of the Reformation.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Burton's list of 1415, Nos. 22 and 25, printed in *York Plays*, pp. xix ff. The second list is in Davies, *York Records of the Fifteenth Century*, pp. 233 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Plays 4 and 41, and part of 7. Compare Burton's list of 1415, Nos. 4, 17 and 7.

<sup>3</sup> Spencer seems to be mistaken (*Corpus Christi Pageants*, p. 38) in stating that the crafts went to the town register to copy their individual scenes. How could the crafts whose plays were not entered do so? He also falls, I think (p. 54), to interpret the marginal notes correctly.

<sup>4</sup> Hemingway, *English Nativity Plays*, p. 264, seems to think that our present text at this point is the "matter" referred to, and that it dates from the sixteenth century. But Miss Smith, p. xxviii, definitely assumes that the Prologue of Y 12 is in the same hand as the body of the manuscript, which she dates 1430-40. The note, therefore, must refer to lines not registered.

<sup>5</sup> For examples of the *nota* indicating alterations and corrections—there are some fifty of them—cf. *York Plays*, pp. xv, xvi, and the text itself. In some cases they may refer to changes made after 1568 (Miss Smith does not seem to me quite clear on this point), but in others they are obviously addressed to Dr. Hutton and point to revisions before this date. That some changes in the plays were registered and some not is apparent. Thus the Innkeepers registered both their plays, one probably not until 1483 (Intro., p. xlii), and in Y 7 two leaves were removed from the register and the new lines, written to fill the lacuna, were added upon a blank page at the end of the play. On the other hand, various plays were never registered, or registered very late, and the numerous cases of "Hic caret," in one case of "Hic caret finem. This matter is newly mayd & devysed, wherof we haue no copy regystred" (p. 177), show that the rules were not stringent. Cf. also note 4, above.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *York Plays*, p. xvi.

<sup>7</sup> The order of 1575 states that the *play bookes* were to be "reformed" "by the lawes of this realme."

By comparing Burton's two lists (that of 1415 must be denuded of its late interlinings and corrections) with the body of plays written about 1430-40,<sup>1</sup> and then by comparing these plays with the additions to the cycle written in later hands, we may form some small idea of the changes taking place in the plays after 1415.<sup>2</sup> What occurred during the end of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth centuries, a much more important period in the development of the cycle, can only be conjectured. It is safe to assume, however, that then as later—and to a still greater extent—plays were rearranged, revised, and rewritten.

Our records, of course, are by no means complete. That the text was far from being the most important element in the pageants, the paucity of references to it, the small sums expended upon it, and, on the other hand, the heavy disbursements for stage properties, the fines for inadequate acting, etc., all eloquently testify.<sup>3</sup> The records that we possess, however, seem to me to point to the crafts and not to the town authorities as those held responsible for the texts. To be sure, as the town authorities became more and more powerful they tended to interfere more and more in the affairs of the guilds. The corporation at York in 1568, 1575, and 1579 ordered the plays "corrected," i.e., "reformed," but whether the guilds, like those of Chester in similar circumstances,<sup>4</sup> were to undertake any of these corrections themselves is uncertain. How early such municipal authority may have been exerted elsewhere I do not know. At Beverley in 1519-20 the twelve governors seem to have spent 7 s., "being with Sir William Pyers, poet, at Edmund

<sup>1</sup> The date assigned to the greater portion of our MS by its editor.

<sup>2</sup> It must always be remembered that only changes affecting a few essentials can be detected from Burton's slight summaries. Thus he knows nothing of the Prologue of Y 12 in 1415; he includes an *obstetrix* in Y 14, who disappeared from the play before it was registered; Y 16 and 17 were one play when he first wrote both lists, and this play apparently excluded two characters which now appear; the 1415 play on the Purification—ours dates from 1558—had *duo filij Symeonis*; play 19 had four soldiers and four women instead of the two each in our present play; and so on. The list is too long to cite, but it will be noted that F. W. Cady in his article on "The Liturgical Basis of the Towneley Mysteries," *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XXIV, 419 ff., takes no account of them.

<sup>3</sup> It is therefore pleasant to discover that at York in 1476, the "moste connyng discrete and able players" of the city were to "serche" and "examen" not only all the *plaiters* and *pagentes* belonging to the *Corpus Xti plaie* but also the *plaies* as well; cf. *York Plays*, p. xxxvii. (I assume that the guilds were ordered to revise those found unsuitable; cf. the Smiths' accounts of Chester, above.)

<sup>4</sup> Cf. p. 568.

Metcalf's house to make an agreement with him for transposing (?) ['transposicione'] the Corpus Christi Play," and 3 s. 4 d. were "given to the said William Pyers for his expenses and labour in coming from Wresill to Beverley for the alteration of the same."<sup>1</sup> These items certainly suggest that in 1519-20 the twelve were concerned in the *transposicione* of the Beverley cycle. That they paid for any work done upon it is not so evident. The first item may record a payment merely for the convivialities of the occasion,<sup>2</sup> the second a payment for the poet's expenses only, but in any case the instance is unique, so far as I know, and of late date, and the sums seem too small to indicate extensive revision. Except for these records, however—that of York definitely related to the unusual circumstances of the Reformation and that of Beverley uncertain—I find nothing to suggest that the cycles were subjected to revision *in toto*. On the other hand, as I have indicated, there seem to be many reasons for assuming that in the great towns where the guilds controlled the other details of their pageants they also supervised the texts of the plays.

The application of these results to the Towneley plays is obvious. No records from the guilds of Wakefield have been found, but Chambers conjectures<sup>3</sup> that our manuscript of the plays is, like that of the Y plays, a *registrum*, and all critics apparently agree that the cycle, as we have it, is highly composite in nature. Davidson<sup>4</sup> is of the opinion that a single compiler garnered his material from here and there, linking it together by verse of his own. Pollard<sup>5</sup> refers to "the period when the York plays were being incorporated into the cycle." Cady finds evidence that the entire cycle was revised by two successive editors. In view of the situation elsewhere, I am inclined to believe that we have in T as in Y a collection of plays each subjected, at least during its formative period, to the vicissitudes

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. MSS Comm., Bev.*, p. 171.

<sup>2</sup> Note the entry almost immediately afterward: "5 s. 8 d. expenses of Mr. Receiver and the 12 Governors at Antony Goldsmyth's house dining on two bucks there. 3 s. 4 d. to the Lord Cardinal's foresters for bringing them."

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, 143.

<sup>4</sup> *English Mystery Plays*, p. 129.

<sup>5</sup> *Towneley Plays*, p. xxvi.

of life within its particular craft.<sup>1</sup> Some of the crafts were fortunate in being able to command the services of a remarkable Wakefield playwright.<sup>2</sup> Others were content to borrow from Y, perhaps revising or rewriting later. Still others continued to use old plays pieced out by borrowings from elsewhere or enlivened by a scene or two from the hands of the Wakefield dramatist. The possibilities are almost inexhaustible, and nearly every play when thus considered presents a separate problem.

Accordingly, we cannot assume, I think, that at some period a couplet or a quatrain editor made his way through the whole cycle—especially since couplets and quatrains would offer the easiest forms for emendations at any time. Nor is it possible to posit a "York period" in the T cycle, although Y plays may have been more fashionable among Wakefield playwrights at some times than at others. Indeed, to make confusion worse confounded, the Y plays were themselves undergoing the various processes of change all the while.<sup>3</sup> In my opinion, we can assume, however, that old plays were being rewritten and that borrowed plays were being rewritten. And this fact seems to me to account for the origin of certain resemblances between the cycles, both of structure and of phrase, that are otherwise not readily explained.<sup>4</sup>

GRACE FRANK

BRYN MAWR, PA.

<sup>1</sup> Compare the two versions of the *Shepherds' Play* with the two plays on the *Fall* belonging to the Norwich grocers, and the two plays on the *Coronation of the Virgin* belonging to the York innkeepers.

<sup>2</sup> Compare the paradoxically similar situation at Coventry where several guilds requisitioned the pen of Robert Croo—and were less fortunate.

<sup>3</sup> As Gayley has pointed out, we actually find the influence of various different strata of Y in T. Cf. *Plays of Our Forefathers*, pp. 161 ff.

<sup>4</sup> I shall hope at some future time to illustrate the application of this theory of revisions as well as to examine certain other hypotheses connected with the relations between the cycles.

## REVIEWS AND NOTICES

---

*The Sonnets of Shakespeare. From the Quarto of 1609 with Variorum Readings and Commentary.* Edited by RAYMOND MACDONALD ALDEN. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1916. Pp. xix+542.

A *New Shakespeare Quarto. The Tragedy of King Richard II.* Printed for the third time by Valentine Simmes in 1598. Reproduced in facsimile from the unique copy in the library of William Augustus White. With an Introduction by ALFRED W. POLLARD. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1916. Pp. 104+Sig. A-I.

*Shaksperian Studies.* By Members of the Department of English and Comparative Literature in Columbia University. Edited by BRANDER MATTHEWS and ASHLEY HORACE THORNDIKE. New York: Columbia University Press, 1916. Pp. vii+452.

These volumes, representing in three different fields notable products of the Shakespeare Tercentenary, show a degree of excellence that makes the reviewer's task comparatively simple.

Professor Alden's edition of the Sonnets, following the plan and method of Furness' New Variorum editions of Shakespeare's plays, and uniform with those volumes in presswork, size, and binding, is worthy of its place in the series. As far as I can judge, the immense task of reprinting the original text of 1609 and recording variant readings of later editions, of selecting and abridging all important annotation, and of digesting the vast literature on the Sonnets, has been performed with excellent judgment and remarkable accuracy. The introductory pages and the appendix give the history of the text and of the schools of interpreters, select passages of criticism, the important sources, and summaries of the varied arguments on the arrangement of the Sonnets and on the biographical interpretations centering around "the onlie begetter," the Friend, the Rival Poet, and the Dark Lady. Personally I regret that in this edition special attention has not been given to the influence exerted on Shakespeare's Sonnets by Petrarchan, Platonic, and Court-of-Love conventions. If, however, one were inclined to regret the absence of a full record of the vagaries of biographical and other interpretations, a glance at Mr. Alden's enormous bibliography for the Sonnets will give him pause. Yet either a short summary of other theories in regard to the Dark Lady should have been included with the survey of the influence of

Willobie's *Arise* on the surmises in regard to her, or cross references should have been given to parts of the appendix and notes where other theories are stated, for Dark Lady, Friend, and Rival Poet do not appear in the index to aid one in following the history of the interpretation of the Sonnets.

For students of Shakespeare interested especially in bibliography and text, the most important contribution of the tercentenary year of Shakespeare's death is the discovery and publication in facsimile of a new Quarto of *Richard II*. The volume is a beautiful specimen of book-making, and the reproductions are remarkably clear and uniform. It is gratifying that this Quarto is edited by A. W. Pollard, whose recent bibliographical works have contributed so much to the understanding of Shakespeare and his fellows. His long introductory essay on the text of *Richard II* gives a systematic catalogue, analysis, and classification of all the errors and the notable variations of the texts in the order of their publication, from the Quarto of 1597 through the Folio. Some critic may rise to challenge details of his conclusion, but the method must remain a model. In this investigation the new Quarto, the second belonging to the year 1598, based on the first of that year, aids materially. It derives further importance from the possibility, considered by Mr. Pollard but rejected, that it was used for the Folio text. Mr. Pollard's conclusion is that the Quarto of 1597 furnishes the text nearest to Shakespeare's original form, and that the Folio was set from the fifth Quarto, that of 1615, with some revisions from a copy of the first Quarto used by Shakespeare's company, in which certain corrections of the text, variations in the stage directions, and omissions of passages were found. To my mind, the chief difficulty in accepting this conclusion as final lies in the doubt as to whether fifty lines found in the Quarto of 1615 would have been omitted in the Folio. An interesting deduction of the editor is that Shakespeare's original manuscript was probably used for setting up the first Quarto, and that the punctuation of this Quarto, scant in the main, was intended to guide the actor in the rendering of the lines.

The Columbia *Shakesperian Studies*, with no brilliant essays giving individualistic interpretations or striking discoveries, is very valuable for its inquiries into the methods and purposes of Shakespearian study and for its application of modern logical methods, in various ways, to Shakespearian problems. One essay surveys the points of view and the methods of those who have sought to interpret Shakespeare's personality. Others deal with his use of his sources, with the principles of pronunciation in his day, with stage tradition as contributing to interpretation, with the points of view of American editors, with the interpretation of *Midsummer Night's Dream* in its presentations on the New York stage at various periods, with the structure and characterization of *Julius Caesar* in the light of Shakespeare's sources and his variations on them, with the meaning of *Troilus and Cressida*, with the artistic power of *Romeo and Juliet*, with Parolles not as a weak reflection of Falstaff but as a reflection of Elizabethan manners, with a comparison of



the modern point of view in regard to Henry V with the Renaissance idealization of him as a man of action, with a rational analysis of Hamlet ("Reality and Inconsistency in Shakspeare's Characters"), with "Shakspeare on His Art," with "Shakspeare and the Medieval Lyric." On the whole, the volume furnishes an excellent example of modern historical and common-sense criticism.

C. R. BASKERVILL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*English Literature from Widsith to the Death of Chaucer. A Source Book.* By ALLEN ROGERS BENHAM. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1916. Pp. xxviii+634.

The title of this book is misleading since the work itself contains little material dealing directly with literature. A survey of the table of contents reveals this fact and at the same time the real character of the book. The two chapters into which the work is divided, the first treating of England to the Norman Conquest (pp. 1-139), the second, of the period to the death of Chaucer (pp. 140-613), are arranged under the following headings: The political background, social and industrial background, cultural background, linguistic background, literary characteristics, representative authors. Obviously the aim of the book is not to present the literature of the period but to give such a historical and cultural background as will make an understanding of the literature possible: it is in fact a source book for mediaeval English history. This purpose it fulfils very well. It gives extracts (in translation) from chronicles, sermons, poems (chiefly illustrative of aspects of mediaeval life); in footnotes it offers extensive bibliographical information. In nearly all cases the passages selected are well chosen, and the total effect of the book is to give perhaps the best general impression of mediaeval English life to be found between the covers of a single volume.

Individuals will naturally differ in their opinions as to what such a book should contain. To one reader at least the treatment of literature seems inadequate. Only three literary types—romance, drama, history—are exhibited in the Middle English period. Of the translations from Old English poetry none is in the old metrical form. There are, moreover, errors in some of the translations: on page 35, for example, *since* is rendered "treasured life" and *after maddum-welan*, "thereafter." The literal meanings fit perfectly. More important, however, is the mistranslation of the refrain in "Deor's Lament" (see Lawrence, *Mod. Phil.*, IX, 23 ff.). In a note on page 72 Beadohild and Mæthilde are said to be the same despite the wide divergence of opinions among scholars. The translation of *bryne* as "shield" on p. 371 (*Gawain and the Green Knight*) makes nonsense out of the passage. The sentence on p. 91, "Old English literature is characterized by its simple

literary form and style, its unsophisticated versification and rhetoric, and by its restricted range of types," even with its qualifying note, must give an entirely wrong impression to the uninformed reader. It is to be noted also that the author does not let the reader know which of his documents are in English and which in Latin (he even mixes the two in the note on p. 91).

The linguistic texts show many misprints. P. 75, l. 6 read *lausei uns*; p. 76, l. 3 of Cædmon's hymn, *uuldurfadur*; p. 77, last line, *aldormon*; p. 78, l. 7, *noldan*; l. 18, *weordunga*; p. 79, l. 8, *almæhtiges*; l. 11, *aselle*; Cædmon's hymn, l. 1, *herigea*; l. 2, *Meotodes meahthe ond his modgeþanc*; l. 5, *sceop*; l. 8, *Drihten*. The texts use *ae* or *æ* without regard for the spelling in the originals. In the Middle English texts *ȝ* is avoided, and in its place various alterations are made without consistency, e.g., *reȝhellboc* to *folllzhenn* becomes *regellboc* to *follyhenn* (p. 489). Wouldn't an uninformed person be likely to pronounce the last word as a trisyllable? On page 492 *hallzhe* is represented both by *hallghe* and by *hallyhe*; on p. 497 *drayeth* and *to-dragen* (in both of which the original has *ȝ*) appear. There are misprints in the Middle English texts also. P. 487, l. 8 (of the *Bruce*) read *lay*; l. 9, *thow-sandis*; p. 487, l. 6, *That*; following this a line has dropped out, *Till that Rycharde off Normandy*, and the lines of translation at that point are misplaced; l. 13 read *discumfyt*. P. 489, l. 1 of the *Ormulum*, read *flaeshess*; p. 490, l. 9, insert *itt* after *icc*; l. 13 read *te* after *tatt*; p. 492, l. 3, *wilenn*; l. 8, *writenn*; p. 493, l. 4, *Ormin*; l. 6, *Thiss*, *teyy*; p. 494, l. 1, *alle kinerichen*; l. 4, *tha*; p. 495, l. 5, *thæinen*; l. 7 read *dugethe* and insert *ther* after *duntes*; l. 8, insert *tha* after *while*; l. 12, *yisle* should be *gisle*; l. 14 read *Arthure*; p. 496, l. 7 *floh* should be *sloh*; l. 14 read *Tha*; p. 498, l. 9, *seten*; l. 11, *gleomen*; l. 12, *dugethe*; p. 499, l. 11, *abuten*, *uten*; l. 12, *to-gæines*; p. 500, l. 2, *beord*; l. 10, *Aevereaelches*; l. 12, *yelpen*; p. 501, last line, transpose *on* and *him*; p. 502, l. 1 read *Arthure*; l. 1 (of the *Ayenbite*), *ywyte*; l. 6, *Thet*, *inwyttle*; l. 8, *Thet*, *yewe*; p. 503, l. 2, *onderuonge*; l. 4, *sanynt*; l. 2 (of the *Proclamation*), *Yrloande*; p. 504, l. 3 insert *to* before *werien*; p. 505, l. 4, read *Northfolke*, *Marescal on*.

In note 1, page 1, reference should be made to H. M. Chadwick, *Origin of the English Nation*, Cambridge, 1907. Page 368, note 18, should refer to the best translation of *Gawain* by K. G. T. Webster and to Professor Kittredge's book. The statement that the *Parlement of Foules* celebrates the marriage of Richard II should be modified in view of Professor Manly's article in Morsbach's *Studien*, L, 279 ff.

J. R. HULBERT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

65